

The SPIRIT of [unclear] Alexander

Calumny and Slander,

Examin'd, Chastis'd, and Expos'd,

IN A LETTER. TO A MALICIOUS LIBELLER.

MORE

Particularly Address'd to Mr. GEORGE RIDPATH,
Newsmonger, near St. Martins in the Fields.

CONTAINING

Some Animadversions on his Scurrilous Pamphlets,
Published by him against the Kings, Parliaments, Laws,
Nobility and Clergy of Scotland.

TOGETHER

With a short account of Presbyterian
Principles and Consequential Practices.

Tenuer est mendacium, perlucet si diligenter inspexeris.
Senec.

London: Printed for Joseph Hindmarsh, at the Golden-Ball
over against the Royal Exchange. 1693.

AC477.16575
The *British* *Chamber*
of *Commerce* and *Industry*

London, Charing Cross, and Victoria

1871

Y E T T E

TO

MATCIOUS LIBERTY

MORE

London, Addis & Co. to Mr. George Riddell

CONTAINING

Some Account of the Settlement of the
Principles of the *British* *Chamber* of *Commerce* and *Industry*

TOGETHER

With a short account of the *British* *Chamber* of *Commerce* and *Industry*

Principles of the *British* *Chamber* of *Commerce* and *Industry*

London, Addis & Co. to Mr. George Riddell

London, Addis & Co. to Mr. George Riddell

TO THE

READER.

IT is not much worth the while to inform the World, that now Mr. *George Ridpath* is at the Head of the Presbyterian Party in Scotland. His Associates there, and here, have such an Opinion of him, that they consider him as the Invincible Champion of their Cause; and the truth is, if any Man be so inconsiderable, and so much a Brute, as to fight him at his own Weapons, Mr. *Ridpath* will certainly carry the Prize. He's the Man, that is now most likely to pull down *Anti-christ*, and the *Whore of Babylon*. And as for the Scotch Episcopal Clergy who yet retain any kindness for the *Hierarchy*, and the former Government, if he lives another year, they must all of them be banish'd the *Isle of Britain*. It is enough for you to know, that now the Presbyterians, as is probable, have by an unanimous Suffrage chosen him to manage the Libels against their Opposites. He now appears in the Field of Battel, with all the Noise,

To the Reader.

Lies, and Clamour, that becomes a Zealous Covenanter. He began this last years Campagne with a Libel against Dr. M--o, which valuable Book he Dedicated to the Parliament of Scotland; by this, one may easily infer, that either he had a mean Opinion of the Parliament, or extraordinary thoughts of himself.

If the following Treatise cannot be reduc'd into any certain Method, this is not to be imputed unto me; for I must confess that I too much follow'd the Excursions of Mr. Ridpath's invention. I was willing to contract the Animadversions that I made upon his Book into as little room as was possible; and therefore the frequent Transitions from one thing to another, are best understood, by such as have Read his Continuation, &c. I hope most Men are better employed than either to think or speak of the Calumnies and Lies, that he industriously heaps together against the Clergy. His Party is resolv'd to make use of such Engines against the Church, as they and their Fore-Fathers found most successful to the Extirpation of Root and Branch: and they that are unacquainted with their Malicious Methods, are great Strangers to our Nation, and History.

If the Reader meet with some Paragraphs that are more *particular*, and *peculiar* to Mr. Ridpath, than the Publick is oblig'd to take notice of, I must be excus'd, since I was compell'd; for I assure you, that

To the Reader.

that I value personal altercations no otherwise than a good Christian ought to do: Nor did I ever write to satisfie or convince Mr. *Ridpath*, that being a thing in it self impossible. There is a certain Order of Mean Spirited Fellows (I do not mean by their External Quality) who think that there is nothing written by their Party, (were it never so ignominiously fulsome and scandalous) but what is invincible and unanswerable. Their Pride, and Vanity are incurable. It is not my meaning that we ought to put our selves to the Drudgery of answering all the Scurrilous and Obscene Libels that are propagated by our Enemies, but 'tis reasonable to let our Friends see, that at some times we can Confuse them if that be thought convenient. I am so far convyinc'd of the weakness of their Reasonings, that I know no Sect, Antient, or Modern, that ever broke the Peace of the Christian Church, but may be more plausibly defended, than the latest Edition of *Presbytery in Scotland*.

I never thought that the Reputation of my Friend was in any hazard by being attack'd by Mr. *Ridpath*, or the Little Creatures who instigate him; yet by the following Papers, I make it plain to all disinterested persons, that Mr. *Ridpath* lies Willfully and Deliberately in several Instances; and therefore I may be allow'd to take leave of him for the future, if he does not manage his accusations, as becomes the

To the Reader.

the Spirit of Truth, Innocence, and Ingenuity. If you think that the Style is more sharp than is Decent or Just, then I intreat you may Read his Books which occasion'd these Papers, and then I am confident that you will retract your Censure, and find that I have meddled with his Person as little as was possible. He is in some places so Obscene that there is no coming near him, and therefore I made all possible hast to rid my imagination of him, and theaultry Træsh that he gathers together.

The Bookseller was willing to Print a Sheet or two more than the Letter that I address'd to Mr. Ridpath, and therefore I gave him some Propositions that are extracted out of such Books as are most in Vogue amongst the Scotch Presbyterians, that the Reader might have a sample of their Moral Theology with regard to *Obedience, Government, and Subjection*. To which I have added a Letter, written from the *Tolbooth of Edinburgh* by the Famous Assassin Mr. James Mitchel, who endeavours to prove from several Texts of Scripture, that he ought to kill Dr. Sharp, *Lord Archbishop of St. Andrews*. In short, to use the words of a Great Man, *Rebellion is the Soul of the Kirk*. And though we had not known the History of that Parliament *Anno 1645*. (So they call'd the bloody Meeting at St. Andrews) we have later Instances of their Arbitrary and Tyrannical Malice against the better half of

To the Reader.

of the Nation. Their very Patrons are ashame'd of them (not through any ingenuous remorse) but because their bare fac'd Villanies are frequently expos'd. I think the following Letter needs no other Preface than what is already hinted by

Sir,

Your humble Servant,

S. W.

The

To the Governor
of the Nation. The poor may become the victims of
spies (not enough say informants to identify) but per-
haps higher still the public will turn to the identity exposed.
I think the following letter needs no other preface
than that it is surely right by

Sir

your humble Servt

S. W.

Life

The C O N T E N T S.

THE Occasion of this Letter.

Mr. Ridpath, the Author of two or three Scurrilous and abusive Pamphlets against the Kings, Parliaments, Laws, Nobility, and Clergy of Scotland	Page 1
His Rage and Passion against the Author of the Apology for the Clergy of Scotland	Ibid.
His Challenge fairly embrac'd. The Author of this Defence undertakes to prove that there is not a good Consequence in Mr. Ridpath's Books from the beginning to the end	p. 2
The Character bestowed upon Mr. Rutherford by the Author of the Apology, no justifiable ground of Mr. Ridpath's clamorous bawling against the Learn'd Advocate	Ibid.
Mr. Ridpath's accusation against Sir George Mackenzie in the case of C. of C. founded only on his own Petulance and Malice	p. 3
His Ridiculous advices to the Ministers of State in England, and his Civilities to K. W. and Q. M.	Ibid.
His imitation of the famous Presbyterian Buffoon Dr. Bastwick, when he reviles the present Clergy of the Church of Scotland	p. 4
His impudence in charging the Archbishop of Glasgow with so many unheard of Crimes	p. 5
His Vanity in thinking that his Books do greater Feats than the other Scribblings of his Party	p. 6
His Civilities to the Clergy of the Church of England; and his particular Forgeries against the Author of the Apology	Ibid.
His Critical Skill examin'd. And his officious interposal in the Defence of Mr. Rule further Chastis'd	Ibid.
A Train of many impertinent Lies together agaist Dr. Monro expos'd	p. 7
His stupid ignorance in the History of the first Reformation of Scotland; and in the Doctrine of the first Reformers	p. 8
(a)	His

The Contents.

His Feeble attempts to prove the Divine Right of Presbytery Ibid.

His abominable Lies in charging the Government with unheard of Cruelties p. 9

The Cameronians prov'd to be the most zealous Presbyterians. And Mr. Ridpath's Argument against their Authority, prov'd from Presbyterian Principles to be no Argument at all Ibid.

His Argumentum ad hominem from the Viscount of Dundee's Practices proves no more than that he is ignorant in the first Elements of Logick p. 10

His comparison between the Practices of the Church of England, and those of the Scotch Presbyterians, scandalous and impertinent Ibid.

Presbyterians more cruel and barbarous than any other People. This prov'd by a memorable instance in the year 1645. p. 11

The Covenanters less skilful than the Inquisitors, but equally Cruel p. 11

His ignorance further expos'd p. 12

The Dr. us'd no Equivocation when he said, that the Covenant was rigorously impos'd upon Children Ibid.

This prov'd by an Act of the Gen. Ass. 1648. p. 13

The Charge of Equivocation disprov'd and retorted p. 14, 15

The Practice of the Episcopal Clergy in exposing the Presbyterians, vindicated from Levity and Profanity Ibid.

The Cameronians the most active, and the most consequential Presbyterians p. 16

His derivation of the Word Enthusiasm, compar'd with such another Critical Essay of a Bedlamite Ibid.

The Acts of the General Assembly, especially those of 48, and 49, do sufficiently Vindicate K. Ch. 2. from all imputations of rigor and cruelty p. 17

Sir George Mackenzie gave a true Narrative of the first Rise and Occasion of those Laws that the Presbyterians complain of p. 18

One of the Pedling Scribbles in favours of Presbytery, his weakness

The Contents.

weakness, silliness and ignorance, fairly expos'd in some Particulars	p. 18, 19
Mr. Ridpath's Lies, viz. that Sir Geo. Mackenzie persecuted Hamilton of Hallside, refuted by Hallside himself	Ibid.
No Laws made against Presbyterians as such, but against Seditions, Tumults, and Insurrections	Ibid.
His method of answering Arguments by suppressing such Words, upon which their strength depends	p. 19, 20
The Presbyterians in general charg'd with Rebellious Principles and Practices. This made good against the whiffling exceptions and evasions of Mr. Ridpath	p. 21
The King and Parliament did not consider them as Presbyterians, but as stubborn and incorrigible Rebels	Ibid.
The Majority of the People for the Episcopal Clergy	Ibid.
His rude and inconsiderable Lies against the Earl of Airly, and the Laird of Meldrum	p. 22
The Doctrine of Passive Obedience fairly stated and defended	p. 23, 24
The Presbyterian Exceptions disprov'd and retorted	Ibid.
Mr. Ridpath's incurable infelicity in mistaking true Sense for Contradictions	Ibid.
The Writings of Mr. Rutherford prov'd obscure, and Mr. Ridpath invited to defend them	p. 25, 26
Mr. Ridpath's impudence in denying the Blasphemies that are to be seen in Mr. Rule's Books	p. 26, 27
His blustering ignorance further expos'd	p. 28
The Presbyterians prov'd to be the first aggressors in the Trade of Libelling, and the only experienc'd Practitioners	p. 28, 29, 30
The additional accusations against Dr. Monro proves no more than Mr. Ridpath's wickedness and malice	p. 30, 31
The Murder of Archbishop Sharp prov'd to be the result of Presbyterian Principles	p. 32
The Presbyterians by their Principles not oblig'd to Form	p. 33
The Charge of Pedantry brought against the Doctor disprov'd and retorted	p. 33, 34, 35
Our Ecclesiastical Superiors did not connive at the Faults of the	
	Subscr-

The Contents.

Subordinate Clergy, tho they proceeded against such as were complain'd of by the Orderly and tedious Methods of the Law	p. 35
Mr. Ridpath further chastis'd for his ignorance in the History and Principles of the Presbyterians	p. 35, 36
His ungovernable Malice against Dr. Canaries in many rude and impertinent efforts canvass'd and examin'd	p. 37
His willful and affected mistake of the Author of the Post-scripts meaning	p. 38
His ignorance of a formal Contradiction	p. 39
The Presbyterians accuse all Men of plotting against the Government, because plotting is their only Element	p. 40
Mr. Ridpath's Hypocrisie, wishing, that both Parties may be tender of one another, when his Practice in the next Line confutes all his pretences of Piety	Ibid.
His common Topick to justifie his Calumnies, viz. That he does not know what he writes to be false, further expos'd and ridicul'd	Ibid.
His Ignorance in opposing the knowledge of Arms to the Liberal Arts and Sciences	p. 41, 42
The charge against the Clergy of Stealing their Sermons retorted upon an Impudent Presbyterian Plagiary	p. 42, 43
His Vanity and Ignorance further Chastis'd	p. 43, 44
His affectation of Theology, Logick and Wit, expos'd by plain and palpable instances	p. 45, 46
His Catalogue of Cruelties and Treacheries paralell'd	p. 47, 48,
Another Objection against the Bishops of Scotland consider'd	49
Several Certificates and Letters in favours of the Calumniated Clergy	p. 51, 52, 53
Several Propositions extracted out of the Presbyterian Books	p. 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66
Mr. James Mitchel the famous Assassin his Letter. Justifying from Scripture his Villanous attempt to Murder the Archbishop of St. Andrews.	p. 68, 69, 70, &c.
	Mr. Ridpath,

Mr. Ridpath,

I Have good information from several Persons of known integrity here at *London*, that you are the Author of two abusive Pamphlets by which you endeavour to defame our Kings, Parliaments, and Nobles, such as we had in *Scotland* before the *Revolution*. Our Kings were perjured Tyrants, and K. *Charles II.* knew that he himself had forfeited his *Title to the Crown* *: Our Parliaments were but *pack'd* * *Conti-Clubs*, a company of slavish Parasites, that contributed all they could to *nuat*. the ruin of our Liberties, Civil and Religious; and consequently our Nobility can deserve no better Character, who made so great a Figure in all our Parliaments. As for the Episcopal Clergy whether Bishops or Presbyters, you give them so many names, that it is a wonder you did not think such a despicable company of men below your Notice.

The Book which you call your *Continuation*, most of it is levelled against one particular man; and when I undertake his Defence (if that be necessary) I find that the reading over your book, and transcribing so many parts of it was all the toil I was likely to undergo, and tho you call him whom you fancy to be your Adversary *a man of ungovernable passion*; yet I must tell you that he could not but be mad to the last degree, if he were angry at the names you give him, since they of the first quality in *Europe*, have no fairer quarter at your hands; *A Scribber, a Pedant, a Hawker, a Villain, an Aſi, an Ignoramus, a Blunderer*, are all of them words that he can hear with patience, when his Superiors are not better treated. One may modestly conclude that you are very angry, and that's a greater punishment than any of your Adversaries can inflict upon you. The Author of the *Postscript to the Apology for the Clergy of Scotland*, told you already, that he was not at all concerned in that Scuffle between you and your Antagonist, nor is he likely to offer his mediation to end your Debate; and he is still of the opinion, that he can employ his time better than to read again your *Answer*, or the Book that occasioned it. His *Postscript* is a short Epistolary account of the first, or rather a Character of the present methods of *Presbytery*, in imitation of their *Predecessors*, than any particular view of your Book, and I am content that you impute this to his ignorance or weakness or what else you please to call it. It is very odd that you should think that you have power to summon any body to the Press when you please, even when you lurk behind the Curtains. You

take it for granted that Dr. M. was the Author of that *Postscript*, and it may be you hit right enough; yet tho' your Party be lashed in it with some severity, he takes no great pleasure in meddling with particular men further than necessity constrains.

He said, that there was not *a good consequence in your Book from the beginning to the end*; this could not but provoke a man of your courage and mettle. By *a Consequence*, I humbly think he understood a truth deduced from true and solid Principles that overthrows the common cause of Episcopacy, or the reputation of those men whom you asperse, I mean such of the Clergy who were never under any publick censure of the Church. He told you likewise that he had no inclination particularly to examine the imaginary contradictions that you charge your Enemy with, and now I give you the reason, partly because the Thème, as you manage it, yields no edification, partly because the publick is not at all concerned to read such Libels and altercations, and he gives you liberty to triumph as much as you please upon this Head: but if your honour and credit is at stake, and that you find your self concerned more particularly to run him down than any other, he is content to meet you before any competent number of grave witnesses, who by their authority may mitigate such excursions of rudeness as may be feared, if your blood should boil to its usual fervor: and to reason the matter calmly, and (without either huffing, or the terrible language of an Almanzor) to demonstrate that there is not *a good consequence in your Book from the beginning to the end*. And indeed you may excuse me to tell you, that in your last Pamphlet you seem not to understand the very first Elements of Logick.

Moreover, the Author of the *Postscript* incur'd your high displeasure, by saying, that there were abusive Metaphors in Mr. Rutherford's Letters, and some dark and unintelligible passages in his Scholastical Essays: and is this the unpardonable Crime for which there can be no atonement? Mr. Ridpath, this was no reflection upon his Morals, but a plain matter of Fact to be seen by every body that peruseth the Books that are cited. And therefore this could not at all justify your accusing Sir George Mackenzie to have suborned Witnesses; a practice so infamous and so wicked, that I am confident no man of honour will ever say any such thing of the *truly Just, and Learned Advocate*. A previous examination of Witnesses in criminal Cases is not Subornation, but precognition, practised at all times in Scotland before they deponed judicially; and Sir George Mackenzie wanted not many clear evidences to prove that C. of C. was plotting an insurrection against the King and Government about the time of Argyle's rebellion. You may read the elegant History of that insurrection

rection written by the * Bishop of Rochester, and there you may see with your own Eyes several authentick Evidences, upon record, against C. of C. and I must tell you, that Sir George Mackenzie needed not that Gentleman's Assistance to recommend him to the present Court, if he had been ambitious to have been a Favorite; and if he told C. of C. that he had done him an Injury, and begg'd him pardon, how came this Confession to be made publick? if he to whom it was first revealed, under trust, spread it abroad, he is guilty of something that no Gentleman will readily own; but the plain truth is Sir George Mackenzie never told him any such thing, after the manner you represent it; and he had very good reason to expect that the Witnesses against C. of C. would judicially depone in publick, the very same things that they asserted in private; and if you please you may remember that there is a greater difference between Sir George Mackenzie and your self, than between Mr. Rutherford and those of our Clergy you trample upon.

Your Advices and Threatnings to the Ministers of State in England are idle, and of no use at all; for Ministers of State will advise according to their Light and Conviction, without any regard to the short-liv'd Pamphlets that fly about the City; nor are they likely to receive their Measures either from you, or any of us who see so little in their Sphere. The Presbyterians in England are not yet ripe for a Rebellion, and they in Scotland can do little to disturb England, without their Assistance, and therefore you had best forbear your Threatnings, for I am apt to think that your Influence in either Nation goes but a little way.

You treat King William no better than other Kings, since, you say, he is prevailed upon to write Letters to the General Assembly that they are not obliged in Law to comply with; but better Lawyers are of another Opinion, and if King William venture upon such Essays of Arbitrary Power, in a little time (according to your Hypothesis) he *contin. p.* may forfeit his Title, since he has none but such as is twisted with the 4. Divine Right of Presbytery. But indeed, Mr. Ridpath, I think we had Kings in Scotland, before we had either Covenants, or Presbytery, or the Claim of Right; and that our fundamental Constitution does not depend upon an Act of the General Assembly, tho' the General Assembly sometimes venture, in terminis, to make an Act against an Act of Parliament.

It is a gentle Compliment that you bestow upon Queen Mary, when you allow the Jacobites to invite her Father to keep the Solon-Geese in the Bass; and I think none is permitted to speak so but

* A true Account of the horrid Conspiracy against the King, &c. printed by Tho. Newcomb. Edit. 2. 1685.

Ælis. Hist. Var. **Mr. Ridpath.** It is not safe for any Government to suffer Buffoons to treat crowned Heads so familiarly; whatever be the Quarrel between Princes, this Language is intolerable; yet some Animals are priviledged to bark at this rate. The *Clazomenians*, coming to *Sparta*, supplied the Thrones on which the *Ephori* sat; when the *Ephori* came to know this Indignity, they bore it patiently, and called for a publick *Herald*, and ordered him to proclaim through the City, that it was lawful for the *Clazomenians* to do things that were unbecoming and undecent, that is to say, such barbarous Rascals were below Reproof and Revenge.

Dr. Pater-son, Dr. Caincros. Two of our *Archbishops* you treat in the same Language that *Dr. Bastwick*, the famous *Presbyterian* Buffoon, used towards the *Arch-bishop* of *Canterbury* and his *Colleagues*, when he tells them that the *Hierarchy* came from the Pope and the Devil, *Diabolus caccavit illos*; ^{1 Vol. pag.} They forsooth must be called *Magnates Ecclesiae*, and the Verity of the matter is, *They are Magna Nates Ecclesiae*. It is tedious to transcribe his Civilities to *Archbishop Laud*, and his Venerable Brethren, and therefore I refer you to the Book cited in the Margin: only there is one of his Complements which I set down, because it hath in it the mean and scurrillous Spirit of the Party; which you copy so exactly that one would have thought *Dr. Bastwick* had been your Father; thus ^{Ib. p. 503.} he goes on (speaking of the Priests of the Church of *England*) They are *secundum Ordinem Diaboli*, a Generation of *Vipers*, proud, ungrateful, illiterate *Asses*: the Church is as full of Ceremonies as a Dog is full of Fleas. And again, One would think that Hell were broke loose, and that the Devils in *Surplices*, in *Hoods*, in *Capes*, and *Rochets*, and in four-squared *Cow-turds* upon their Heads, were come among us, and had beshit us all. Pbo! how they stink! This is the Wit and Civility of an enraged *Presbyterian*; these are the Flights of a Zealot, when inspired to the heighth. You treat *Archbishop Sharp* and the *Archbishop* of *Glasgow*, in the same Language that *Archbishop Laud*, and *Archbishop Spotswood* were complemented by your Predecessors.

There is a Letter here, which I have seen, from the *Archbishop* of *Glasgow* to one of his Friends; which, some time or other may see the light in a larger Treatise. It was occasioned by your obscene Libels against him; I must tell you one thing that is in it, and it may provoke your Curiosity to see it; *He* promises two hundred pound sterl. to any Man that will prove, by *Witnesses* of known Probity, any one Particular that is maliciously vented against him by your self or any of your Informers. Why then do not ye appear openly above-board, for the *Bishop* declines no competent Judge in *Scotland*? 'Tis true, *He* thought that the Book that treated him so barbarously had been

been writ by some of the fluttering *Damme's* about the City, whose most compendious Method to destroy Religion, is, at any rate, to run down the Clergy; but if he had known his Accuser, 'tis more than probable he would forbear any Vindication. *He* was sometimes opposed by Persons of the first Quality in the Nation, and if he had been so wicked a Wretch as you represent him, he had certainly *forfeited his Life to Justice, and his Name to Infamy*, as he expresses it himself in his Letter. Mr. *Ridpath*, do not take it ill that I do not go through the Particulars of your Libel against the *Bishop*, for I have made you a fair Offer already; and besides, when you are better informed, you will find your self that you name some Persons in your Libel, who are lasting Monuments of the Disgrace of your Faction; so that you have as little of the *Wisdom of the Serpent*, as of the *Innocence of the Dove*. You may go on and accuse the *Bishop* and his Collegues of all the Crimes that your Predecessors charged the former *Bishops* with, in the year 1638; nay, which is more, you may accuse him of all the Villainies which your own Major *Wier* actually committed, when he ran about with so many of the Sisters, from one Communion to another: and I assure you that neither he nor any of his Friends will take notice of you. We know very well that you are at extraordinary pains to gather Intelligence against the Clergy, but all your Evidences hitherto are of no Authority at all.

You think that if Mr. *Rule's* Book provoked the Author of the *Contin. p. 10.*
Postscript to *Undecencies of Passion*, the reading of yours would make him *stark mad*. Not so, Mr. *Ridpath*, we may sometimes get a more deadly Wound by an Arrow that flies near the Earth, than by the Thunder that goes over our Heads. He begins, you say, with *downright Nonsense and a notorious Lie*; but one and the same Proposition cannot be both *Nonsense* and a *Lie*; one cannot tell what to make of the first, and therefore it is neither a *Lie* nor a *Truth*: he continues still in the same Opinion, that the Principles and Practices of the *Covenanters* occasioned the Laws that you complain of, whether you mean their Practices from the Year 1637, to the Year 1650; or their Behaviour after the Restoration of King *Charles II*, all is one to me; they overthrew the Monarchy under King *Charles I*, disturbed it by frequent Insurrections under King *Charles II*, and are ready to do so still, if at any time their boundless Tyranny and Ambition be restrained.

The rest of that Paragraph is a Declamation against *Prelacy*, and pag. 12.
the Clergy of *England* must be lashed with the same Severity, where-
with you chastise those of *Scotland*; and in your first Book you re-
present those of *England* as a Company of *treacherous Prevaricators*: *Ans. Scot.*
that Elog. p. 4.

that the Crown set them up by a daring Perjury, and that the same Party hath thrust that Family from the Throne, by a Copy exactly answering the Original. They are obliged very much to your Civilities, if the Family be thrust from the Throne, you are the Author of a new Discovery; but I leave this to their consideration who are more concerned.

Pag. 14.

You are diffident of your Arguments against the Author of the Postscript, and therefore you will take more effectual and compendious methods to ruin him: for you tell us that upon the taking of *Namur*, he was heard in St. James's Park to salute Mr. *Shields* by the title of a *Bishop*, no doubt in view of a *Revolution* which was likely to follow. There is one thing that I thank you heartily for, *viz.* that this accusation is express, particular, and circumstantiated, for when accusations are loose, general, and indefinite, nothing can be fixt upon that can lead us unto the Truth, and therefore Mr. *Ridpath*, here I plainly give you the Lye; I know a man of your honour will resent this affront. The affirmative part is your own, and therefore common sense obliges you to prove it if you can, you are here upon the place, so are they whom you accuse; the Dr. declines no competent Judge in *England*, and if you can prove that ever he spoke with Mr. *Shields* in St. James's Park, he'll acknowledg all the Libels against him to be true, and the only method to save your Reputation in this particular, is to put it to a fair Trial. But I perceive that you are as unfortunate in the informations that you receive against the Clergy, as you are hasty and unadvised in publishing of them.

abid.

Whether the error in *Scotch Grammar* with which you charge the Dr. be an omission of the Printer or his inadvertence, is not material to enquire, he had rather commit a thousand such, than one Latin *Solecism* in a publick Harangue *ex Cathedra*. It is uneasie to live next door to a Grammarian. Read over again the 2d. page of your *Continuation*, l. 21. or the 5th. p. of your *Preface*, l. 30. and tell me if it be exact Grammar. It is impudence beyond comparison, to say, that the Dr. charged Mr. *Rule* falsely with speaking wrong *Latin*; 'tis a wonder to me, why he himself or any of his Friends should be so zealous to defend him upon that Head, and if you would be so wise as to let those stories alone, I know none would be so idle as to revive them; and because you will not suffer us to forget his *Latine*, I will give you one instance more of the purity of his Stile. Asking one of the Students what was his Name, the Youth told him so and so, but not adding his Surname; He asked again, *quid est totum nomen?* At another time missing the Key of a certain Box which is kept in the *Library*, when he would have opened it, he told them that were about him, *Nescio quid factum est de iis, babui mox.* Now the Affirmative is mine,

I am obliged to prove it when ever you put me to it. You are all of you so tender upon the point of Honour, that you let nothing pass without present Revenge, and Mr. Rule himself may know the Wignesses when he pleases, tho' it be not decent to print their Names.

The next accusation against the Dr. is, that he cannot forbear Swearing. Mr Ridpath, I hope it is otherwise; and this is but an Article of the original Libel, answered already in the *Presbyterian Inquisition*. You was advised by the Author of the Postscript, rather to insist on the old Libel than to trust to your own invention. Moreover you say that it can be proved, that he said to a certain Minister, that if the Episcopal party had not the Government, he cared not if the Devil had it. By other accusers this Calumny is otherwise represented, viz. that if the Episcopal party had not the Government, he cared not if the Papists had it; but both are beat out upon the same Anvil*. I wish you had named the Minister to whom this was said; the Devil has but too much of the Government of the World already, and I am afraid that they who publish such malicious and indefinite reports, are more governed by him than they are aware of.

You charge him again, that he hindered the printing of Mr. Jameson's Book, against *Quakerism*; he had no authority to do so, nor was it possible for him to treat Mr. Jameson with greater civility than he did. As for the Oath imposed on the Scholars in King James his time, that is sufficiently accounted for in another * Treatise, and whether you are satisfied or not, it matters not much. The Objections started against it, were but the Whimseys of a malicious Pedant who knew not well what he said.

It must be confessed that He preferred the *French Refugees* to the Scotch *Presbyterians*, when both petitioned the *Town Council* for the use of the publick Hall to preach in upon the Sundays. I am not obliged to believe, upon your authority, that he had any undecent expressions upon that occasion. I incline to think that if the *Presbyterians* had the publick Hall of the College, very many naughty persons would resort unto it, though the *Presbyterian* Ministers should endeavour to hinder it. Now I would gladly ask you one Question, whether ever you had a Scholar, that answered you with greater submission and obedience than I do.

You name a Person at the foot of the 15 pag. whom you say, the Dr. was careful to vindicate, that he never so much as mentioned his Name; but Newsmongers have a greater priviledge than their Neighbours.

* This is glanced at in a late Letter written by a *Presbyterian* Minister to a member of Parliament, p. 11.

P. 15.

* *Presb.*
Inquisit.

Tis

pag. 16.

'Tis certain that the Scheme of the Presbyterian Religion, as far as they differ from the Episcopalian, is nothing else but ungovernable Humour and Rebellion. Now is it necessary to strike off the Doctor's Head for this one Expression. The Presbyterian Opinions, as such, are new and lately started, and peculiar to themselves, nor is there any of the Reformed Churches that ever asserted Presbyterian government to be founded upon such Divine Right as is exclusive of all other Ecclesiastical Polities. The Church of Scotland, which, you say, was Presbyterian from the beginning of the Reformation, declares positively, in her Confession of Faith, that Church Polity is variable, and the Order of Bishops was never condemned by our Reformers; and Buchanan tells us expressly, that our first Reformers were so far from being Presbyterians, that *Scoti ante aliquot annos Anglorum auxiliis e servitute Gallica liberati Religionis cultui & ritibus cum Anglis communibus subscripterunt.*

Buchan.
Hist. lib.
19.

To say that the Church of Scotland should be governed by Presbytery, because Presbyters were most active in the first Reformation, is an unpardonable Impertinence. If all the Bishops in the Church of Scotland had been as zealous to promote the Reformation as the Bishops of Galloway and Argyll, would it therefore follow, that if the Bishops had reformed the Church without the assistance of Presbyters, there ought to be no Presbyters in the Church when it was fully reformed. No, I think this could not follow; and therefore when the Bishops own the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, they must be obeyed, and our Reformers never declaimed against their Order; and if they would adhere to the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, Calvin de-

Calvin. Inst. lib. 4. And again, Lib. 4. c. 10. § 6. *Sane si veri Episcopi essent, aliquid eis in hac parte Auctoritatis tribuerem, non quantum sibi postulant, sed quantum ad Politiam Ecclesie rite ordinandam requiritur.*

termines positively in that Case, that *nullo non anathemate digni sunt*, who stubbornly oppose their Authority; but we had no such thing as Presbytery in Scotland, settled by Authority in all its Pretences, until the Rebellion brake out in the Year 1638. Presbyterians we had, Tumults, Combinations and Factions in abundance, and Interruptions of the legal Government, and Parliamentary Concessions to pacify the Faction; but a total abolishing of the Order of Bishops, before the Rebellion in King Charles I. his time, was never heard, and to say otherwise

Vid. Nals. contradicts the Series of all our Records.

Coll. 1. Vol. 1. If the places of Scripture that you cite, prove that the names of and the K's. those Clergy-men that were above Deacons were not distinguished; Large Ma- nifesto. yet this cannot infer an Equality among them, for the Apostles themselves were called sometimes Presbyters, and the Church was never governed by a perfect Equality of Presbyters. The Ecclesiastical Senate had

had its constant *Præses*, without whose Authority nothing of any moment was transacted. How often do you meet, in the *Old Testament*, the Jewish Clergy dichotomized into *Priests* and *Levites*? Will it therefore follow, that there was no *High-priest* among them to govern the whole Society? you seem to have no other Notion of a *Presbyter* than what you meet with in your late Pamphlets; but it was an honourable *Appellative*, bestowed, in the Apostolick times upon all Orders of Ecclesiasticks above a *Deacon*. Let us know where this Superiority and Jurisdiction of one *Presbyter* above another is forbidden. It was established by God himself in the *Old Testament*, let us see it repealed in the *New*. I think we may leave this Dispute to other *Combatants*, who may have occasion to discourse of it more fully, when the Mortar-pieces are shot that you threaten us with. Only be mindful to let us see those Epistles of St. *Augustine* to St. *Jerom*,  wherein you say that *Episcopacy is proved to be of humane Appointment*.

Your next contains a lamentable Catalogue of Crueltiess that pag. 17. you say the *Presbyterians* in the West did undergo under the former Reigns, *viz.* that some were *roasted before Fires*, &c. I thank God I never heard any such thing before, and if it had been true all *Christendom* would have heard of it, and tho' you had the Authority of the General Assembly to vouch it, you must excuse me if I continue in my former Unbelief.

All your Bauble about the *Cameronians* is neither to your Purpose pag. 18. nor mine, their Practices can never be condemned by *Presbyterian* Principles, and they may be the Standard of *Presbytery* as much as the Ministers you name in that Paragraph. The *Protesters* were not so numerous as the *Resolutioners*, yet you must acknowledge they were the only orthodox *Presbyterians*; for the *Resolutioners* were rotten-hearted Malignants, and the *Protesters* are the present visible Church of the *Presbyterians*; and if they had stood upon the Plurality of Votes, they had yielded to the General Assembly against whom they protested. And this is the fatal and fundamental Error of your Party, that they have no principles of Unity, but such as a plausible Protestation seconded by the Rabble can shake your Ecclesiastical Authority upon all occasions, according to the Original Maxim of Mr. *Andrew Melvil*, *Vota sunt ponderanda, non numeranda*.

Your *Argumentum ad hominem* taken from the *Viscount of Dundee's* Practices, proves no more than your thick and palpable Ignorance in the first *Principles of Logick*. Nothing can be improved as an *Argumentum ad hominem* against any Man, but such Practices as naturally overthrow his own Principles; and do you think that my Lord *Dundee* own'd any true and indisputable Right in them against whom he fought?

and if upon *bis Hypothesis* there was no Title, pray what becomes of your *Argumentum ad hominem*? My humble Advice is, that some one or other of your Friends may teach you the *Vocabula Artis*, before you write so magisterially; and you'll find this to be but a friendly Advice before I have done with you, and whatever Proficiency you have made in *Grammar*, your *Logicks* are but of about two Months standing.

Your Parallel between the Practices of the *Church of England* towards King *James* and those of the *Scotch Presbyterians* towards King *Charles II.* is a true Specimen of your Skill. We know no such Practices of the *Church of England*, nor are we to learn her Doctrines from Scurrilous Pamphlets, but from her *Articles, Homilies, Liturgy, and Canons*.

That the *Presbyterian* Cruelty towards the *Episcopalian*s after the Year 1637, were unparalleled in History, remains still a Truth, because they suffered from Men who declared themselves to be of the same Religion with their Neighbours; the Cruelties of *Papists* towards *Protestants*, and of *Infidels* towards *Christians*, and of *Pagans* towards them who worship one God, cannot make up an exact parallel, because the Rebels by whom our people were persecuted, pretended to be of the same Communion. But since you name the Massacre at *Paris*, you may call to mind that in the Year 1645, the *Presbyterians* under the Command of General *Leslie*, cut in pieces some hundreds of the Marquess of *Montrois* his *Infantry*, in cold blood, after quarter given; when the *Marques's* was betrayed, and that he was forc'd to retire, a considerable body of his Army surrendered their Arms upon Articles, and stood, as they were directed by the *Covenanters*, in a plain open Field, having nothing to defend themselves with but their Nails; then it was time for the *Presbyterians* to discover their true Intentions, and to let the world see that no Promises, no Capitulations could bind up the hands of *Covenanters*, when it was in their power to do Mischief, and you are to remember that this horrid Tragedy was acted at the special Instigation of the godly *Ministers* in the Army, for *Souldiers* know no such Villanies. But the Enthusiastick Zealot who preached, thought that the Blood of so many innocent people was a good beginning of a through Reformation. He chose his Text 1 *Sam.* 15. 14. *What meaneth then this bleating*, &c. insinuating that they could not be said to obey God, as long as they left any alive that were not *Covenanters*, and when General *Leslie*; contrary to his own Inclination, Honour, and Authority, yielded to their Fury, he asked this *Sanguinary Enthusiast*, *Mas John ha' not you Blood enough now?* Compare all Circumstances, and match this in History if you can; not to mention now the throwing so many Women and Children

*Vid. Hist.
Obs. MSS.
by Guth.*

*Montrois
def. at Phi-
liphaugh.*

dren over the Bridge of *Litgow*, without either Form or Process, for no other Crime, but that they followed their Husbands and Relations to *Montrose* his Army. And the former instance is by so much the more remarkable that the poor people who were murdered in cold bloud, contrary to the Laws of Nations, the faith of mankind, and the ancient honour of the *Scots*, were all of them Protestants, and laid down their Arms upon capitulation for their full freedom and safety: to embrew their hands in the bloud of their Countrymen, contrary to the solemnity of Promises, was a thing that could only be acted by *Covenanters*; so that your instances of the *Massacre at Paris*, and the Duke of *Alva's* butchery in the *Netherlands*, are indeed sad abuses of Supreme Authority, and lasting Monuments of cruelty: but that which I just now named, adds to cruelty perfidious treachery, such as blows up the foundations of humane Society.

But Mr. *Ridpath*, you ask if ever you put the *Presbyterians* in *Dungeons to be eaten up of Toads and Serpents*. and if not, you think you may conclude that you fall short of the cruelty of the *Inquisitors*. I answer, whether there are Toads and Serpents in the lower Vaults of the *Tolbooth* of *Edinburg*, I cannot tell, but I am very sure the *Reverend Bishop Wijeweart* was almost eaten up of Vermin in that Dungeon, and bore the marks of the *Covenanters* cruelty, as well as the evidences of his own invincible patience to his dying hour; and if your *Covenanters* at that time were not so ingenious in inventing instruments of bodily torture as the *Fathers of the Inquisition* were, yet you cannot deny but that they were equally fierce and bloody: the *Presbyterians* were only acted by a lower order of *Daemons*, who had not so much light and art, (yet altogether as furious and as opposite to true goodness,) as those by whom the *Inquisitors* were guided.

But you think that though the Dr's Conscience be prostituted to a *Prodigy*, yet it flies in his face, when such and such things are said of the *Covenanters*. Mr. *Ridpath*, I am now pretty well acquainted with this Noise, and you see that I meet your loudest Thunder without any disturbance, and all that I return to this Civility is no more, than to advise you to distinguish between a little fluttering Rhetorick and common Sense; when ones Conscience is prostituted, as you say, to a *Prodigy*, he feels no remorse at all; and therefore his Conscience cannot fly in his face, 'tis seared with a hot Iron, he is proof against all light and conviction, altogether blinded and stupified under the power of his Error. And

Ibid.

if the Dr's Conscience fly in his face, he is still within the possibilities of being recovered, but you must treat him a little more softly if you intend to make him a Proselyte.

Ibid.

But you tell us next, that the Dr. learnt the art of *Equivocation* as well as if he had been at *Rome*; for he says, that the *Covenant* was rigorously imposed upon all, *Children at the Schools not excepted*. To this you answer, that you believe it was required of little Children that offered to take the degree of *Masters of Art* about the age of thirty years, and then you hoise all your Sails, and leave the poor Dr. exposed to all the contempt that a silly So-phister deserves. Now Mr. *Ridpath*, we are again closely engaged, and if I do not get the Dr. out of this mire, I must run for it. If you was your self near thirty years old when you went to the *University*, as you seem to insinuate, one might reasonably presume, that your bloud had been colder before now; and that you would not vapour at this rate, when you had no reserve to defend you, but your ignorance in a plain matter of *Fact*; and therefore all that know *Scotland*, know very well, that the *Children* in our Country ordinarily go to the *University* at the age of twelve, thirteen, or fourteen years; and such may in the strictest sense be called *Children*, and of such it was required to take the *Covenant*: for my part I never knew one amongst them that arrived to the age of thirty before he received his degrees. There was no *Equivocation* in the case, when the Author of the *Postscript* told you, that the *Covenant* was imposed upon *Children at the Schools*, for he meant it of no other *Children* than those younger ones who entered the *University*, and who were not allowed to delay their swearing the *Covenant* until they left it, but were forced as soon as they entred, to take it upon implicite *Faith*; if this is made evident, you must acknowledg that there was no *Equivocation* used by the Author of the *Postscript*. If you set up for a Patron of *Presbyterian* practices, and must needs hector the World into a belief of your blustering *Romances*, if you intend to be successful, you ought to read more and write less; and because the *Affirmative* is now mine, I am obliged to prove it, and if you desire better proof, I'll make you amends; it is the following *Act* of the *General Assembly*.

Act for taking the Covenant at the first receiving of the *Gen. Ass.*
 Sacrament of the Lords Supper, and for the taking of ^{1648. p.} *mibi 44.*
 it also by all Students at the first entry to Colleges. ^{printed by}
^{Ev. Tyler,} ^{Edinb.} ^{An. 1648.}

THE General Assembly according to former re-commendations doth ordain, that all Young Students take the Covenant at their first Entry to Colleges, and that hereafter all Persons whatsoever take the Covenant at their first receiving of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. Requiring hereby provincial Assemblies, Presbyteries and Universities to be careful that this Act be observed, and account thereof taken in the Visitation of Universities, and particular Kirk, in the tryal of Presbyteries.

Now Mr. Ridpath, I hope you are satisfied, that by *Children* were meant those young ones who are but newly come from Country Schools.

The word *Equivocation* brings to my mind some practices of the *Presbyterians*, still upon Record; I mean publick and Solemn Deeds, which seem to justify *Equivocation*, if it be for the glory of God, i. e. if it promote the ends of the Covenant. It is nothing to see you or me *equivocate*; these are the failings of us two private, obscure, and particular Persons, but to see the *General Assembly*, the true and only supreme Representative of the *Kirk of Scotland*, shift, double, and equivocate, is treachery and hypocrisy with a witness. To make you sensible of this, you are to remember as an introduction to what follows, that the Covenanters who went to *Aberdeen* to recommend the Covenant to the Clergy and Professors of Divinity there, told them, that notwithstanding they should swear the Covenant, yet they were left at liberty to Vote for *Episcopacy* when the *General Assembly* met; but when the *General Assembly* met, they concluded *prima instantia*, that *Episcopacy* was abjured in the Covenant: This prevarication is complained of by the *Marques of Hamilton, His Majesties Commissioner*, in a printed Declaration, *Anno 1639.* To this they *Nals Hist.* *anwer*, that they did not expressly and Specifice abjure *Episcopacy*, *Col. 1. Vol. but p. 128.*

but only generally and virtually, by abjuring whatsoever was abjured in the *Confession 1580*. Now the meaning of this is, by their *Covenant* they abjured *Episcopacy virtually*, but not *specifice*. But how could the Members of the *Assembly* be left at liberty to vote freely for *Episcopacy* after they took the *Covenant*, if *Episcopacy* was *virtually* and *generally* abjured in the *Covenant*? this is as much to say, as, tho I am obliged by the Christian Religion *virtually* and *generally* against all degrees of *Theft*, yet I am not obliged *specifice* by my *Baptismal Vow* against picking a *Man's Pocket* of his *Watch*. What a joggle was it to say, that Men might vote freely for that Government which was, for the matter, abjured? These are the *Metaphysical Lectures* that are to be learned in *Presbyterian Schools*, who think nothing to dally with Mens Consciences, by the jingle of a distinction, which, at bottom, is but *Hypocrisie* and *Impertinence*.

V. King's But would you have another sample of their *Casuistical Theology*?
large Ma- read what follows, * in their *Answer to the third Reason*, *Albeit*
nifesto. & *by the meaning of the Prescriber of an Oath, the Swearer were faculy*
Nal. Hist. *bound to maintain Episcopacy, five Articles of Perth, and such like*;
Coll. 1 vol. *pag. 151.* *yet according to the premittted Considerations he is more obliged to the reality*
**Nal. Hist. rei juratæ, which is now declared and found to abjure Episcopacy, † nor*
Coll. 1 vol. to the meaning of the Prescriber, or his own either, being contrary to
Ans to the 3 Reasons. the Explanation of the sovereign Judge competent. Thus far the *Cove-*
nanter. 3 b o w s

^{† than.} Now Mr. *Ridpath*, name any one Proposition more knavish, hypocritical and damnable than this is, that the *Swearer* is neither bound to *the meaning of the Imposer*, nor to *his own meaning* who takes the *Oath*, but to *the reality of the thing sworn*, as it shall be afterwards explained by the competent *Judge*; which, in their meaning, was none else than the *General Assembly*. Did you ever read any thing worse in the *Casuistical Writings* of the *Jesuits*? But it may be that your Curiosity reaches not so far as the moral *Theology* of *Esco-bar*, *Filiucius*, or *Emanuel Sa*. Did even the transcendent Power of *Rome* go higher? If Oaths neither oblige *sensu dantis* nor *jurantis*, but in the sense of the *Kirk*, then we are obliged, without any further Enquiries, to submit our Necks to the infallible Decrees of the *Assembly*, tho we neither know what is in them, nor never intended to oblige our selves by them. I cite a very authentick Paper, being under the hand of Mr. *Archibald Johnston*, Clerk of the *Assembly*. So that the Mother *Kirk* can evacuate the force of all Oaths, Promises and Subscriptions, to the End of the World: for they do not oblige in the sense of the first *Imposer*, nor according

ding to the meaning of him that swore, but according to the Commentary and Interpretation of the *General Assembly*; and so the next *General Assembly* may pronounce, that by the Test (against which they objected so many sad Stories) we are obliged to maintain and support Presbytery, tho' we swore it with quite contrary Intentions; and indeed there is not any thing to be met amngst the *Jesuits*, more subversive of all Religion and true Morality, than that memorable Position that I named from the Authentick Records of the *Covenanters*.

Some grave Men have been displeased that the Presbyterian Fooleries have been exposed to laughter; and for my part I was not of their Council who first assaulted them in that manner, yet those Gentlemen who accuse the *Episcopal Clergy of Scotland*, as if they had exposed Religion it self, by publishing some of the impertinent and ridiculous Bauble of Presbyterians, must consider, that the learnedest and gravest *Divines*, in this as well as other Nations, have treated Enthusiasts in no other manner. I have no room to insert Monsieur Pascals excellent Letter to the *Jesuits*,

wherein he proves, from the Example of God himself, *La Theologie Morale des Jesuites*, pag. iiiijij 149, 150. *A Cologne*, An. 1666. En vertu des Pères, il ya bien de la difference entre rire de la Religion, & rire de ceux qui la profanent par leurs opinions extravagantes. Ce seroit une impieté de manquer de respect pour les vertus que l'esprit de Dieu a révélées : mais ce seroit une autre impieté de manquer de me priser pour les faussetez que l'esprit de l'homme leur oppose.

I. Dr. Burgess's Sermon before the House of Commons, 1640. the fifth Motive by which he persuaded them to take the *Covenant* was, that the Devil himself will have a *Covenant* from all his Vassals that expect any extraordinary Matters from him; there is not a Witch that hath the Devil at her beck, but she must seal a *Covenant* with him sometimes with her Blood. * Nais. Hist. Coll. 1 vol. pag. 532. Mr.

Mr. Ridpath, you are very angry when we charge the Presbyterians with the odd and extravagant practices of the *Cameronians*, as if such things were disagreeable to their Sentiments: to tell you the truth, I think the *Cameronians* are the most active and ingenuous Subdivision of the Presbyterians; they are the Pioneers in your Camp, whom you hug and embrace as your dearest Brethren, when the roughest part of your Work is to be performed. Upon the late Revolution they drove the Clergy out of the West, and guarded the Convention, and many other considerable Services (they'll tell you themselves) they have done you; and yet forsooth they must not be allowed to be Presbyterians. The *Act of the West-Kirk*, and the *Remonstrance* in the Year 1650. are better Evidences of Presbyterian Principles, than all your little whiffling Excuses and Evasions. Our People took care to publish an *Epitome of the Hind let loose*, not because it was written by any of the *Cameronians*; but rather because he that wrote it, gathered together the *Publick Papers, Remonstrances, Declarations, and Wrestlings* of that Party against the State, in which they lived since the Reformation; and therefore if any suffered hard things under the late Reigns, they were the high-flown Presbyterians; such of them as lived peaceably and modestly, suffered nothing at all: for our Laws never forbade any man to think but that Presbytery was preferable to Episcopacy, if his Opinions and Education led him to think so; but our Governors took care that the Principles of Presbyterians might not break out into Tumults and Insurrections; such as formerly pulled down the *Monarchy*, overthrew the Fundamental Constitution, and turned our Nation into a *Field of Blood*.

Pag. 23. We are very much obliged to your Wit and Invention for your *Derivation* of the word *Enthusiasm*; you prove us *Enthusiasts* from two Arguments, first because we are Drunkards, and next because we use unscriptural Ceremonies. I cannot deny but I was refreshed a little with this extraordinary Flight of your Fancy, and I leave it to all impartial Men to judge whether this *Witticism* of yours, or another which I am going to tell you, be more coherent, rapturous and gentle; nay, I think I may leave it to your own decision, if you are but a little recovered from the career of your Passion: the Story is this, One of my Friends once persuaded me to go along with him to see that sad sight of *Bethlehem Hospital*; as we entred the lower Apartments, we drew near to the Cell of a little grave Man, whom we found reading *Ovid de Tristibus* with great Application. My Friend and I asked him several Questions, all which he answered very pertinently, so that we could not discover for a good while where his

his Madness lay: at last I asked him if he understood the Book he read, he told me he did, and convinces me that what he said was true. I asked him again, how he came to have such a kindness for that Book beyond other Books; at which he smiled with some appearance of Disdain, pitying my Ignorance, that I did not know a thing that he thought was known all the World over: why (said he) *Ovid* is of our Family; and do not you know, (said he) that *Ovidius* is from *Ovis* a Sheep, and the Butchers take *Ovis* by the Neck, and therefore he began his Book *de Tristibus*, with *Parve nec invidio*; from all this he concluded that *Ovid* was of his Family; and, I think, he argued as wisely as you do to prove us *Enthusiasts*.

It is true, the Author of the Postscript said, that the *Acts of the General Assembly* did sufficiently vindicate King Charles II. and his Ministers of State from any Shadow of Rigour or Cruelty; but I must tell you that he meant other Acts than those you guess, and it is a sad thing to have to do with such an Adversary as you; it appears that you have a very good Opinion of your self, and there is not a Quality more essential to a Presbyterian than Pride and Vanity, you have not read the Books you are concerned to read, if you set up for the publick Advocate of the Kirk; how came you to guess what Acts your Adversary meant, unless he had cited those Acts particularly: and therefore I advise you to read the Acts of the General Assembly more narrowly; and see if you can name any of the Papal Enchroachments upon the Civil Magistrate more daring and ambitious than that one Act which is cited in the Margine, and ^{July 28.} which is recorded to the Honour of Presbytery. Mr. Ridpath, ^{1648. ante mer. Sess.} you see that I have a great desire to court your Friendship, since I ^{18.p. mil. i} cite the Books exactly, that you look upon as Oracles.

You tell us, after a long Declamation against King Charles II. his Government and the Doctrine of Passive Obedience; that Sir ^{7. Act and Declar. a-} George Mackenzie's Arguments in the defence of his Reign, are all of ^{gainst the} Act of P. them built upon a false Narrative of Matter of Fact; as if the Re ^{pag. 17.} bellions against King Charles I. and II. were not notorious, and known all Europe over. The Scotch Rebels laid King Charles I. upon the Altar, and the English Rebels sacrificed him; and this is no other Censure than what is obvious to every Man's Observation. Must we sit down and transcribe all the Presbyterian Protestations, Remonstrances, reasonable Warnings, and Declarations, when every little Pamphlet is answered? Must we prove that Presbyterians are Rebels? that is as needless as to prove first Principles: for since the Covenant is the *Magna Charta* of your Religion, as you are distin-

guished from other Christians, why should you think the Imputation of Rebellion to be any Reproach? Sir *George Mackenzie* gave the World a true *Narrative* of the first Rise and Occasion of those Laws that you complain of. And we are very glad how much you write against it, you but wound your own head, and *kick against the pricks*: for his *Narrative* remains true, and founded upon the Records of Parliament, and Progress of your Rebellion, and still unanswered, as it is unanswerable. I know that one of your Club wrote a Pamphlet against his *Defence of King Charles II's Government*, entitled, *a Vindication of the Presbyterians in Scotland, &c.* It peeped out, as if it were afraid to see the light, but no body knows where to find it, and in a few days it evanished. 'Tis said to be printed for *Edward Golding*, 1692. I got one Copy accidentally, but all my Industry could not procure another. The Author is a very accomplish'd Gentleman, no doubt of it; he tells you, in the very first page of his Pamphlet, that he left the *Law* part unanswered. And this one Expression is enough to proclaim him a Fool; that he who had no knowledge in the Laws, should venture to answer Sir *George Mackenzie's* Book; just as if one should censure the Works of *Tully* and *Quintilian*, without any knowledge of the Rules of *Oratory* and *Rhetorick*; and, to let you see how grossly ignorant this poor Creature is, he tells us, that *King Ch. I. when the Earl of Traquair sat at the Helm of Affairs, imposed on the Subjects an Oath, commonly called the Tender, with great Severity, and that, it is not improbable but that the Covenant was a Counter-Oath to that.* Now Mr. *Ridpath*, I ask you how any Man can forbear smiling to see how such a little *Shuttle-cock* can assault the Memory and Writings of Sir *George Mackenzie*? Was the Covenant no older than the *Tender*? and was the *Tender*, (by which Men were made to part with all degrees of *Loyalty*, and to renounce the *Family of the Stewarts*) imposed with great Severity by King *Charles I.* and is this the Book that you think confutes Sir *George Mackenzie's Vindication*, better than the Doctor can defend it? But your learned Author goes on, and tells us that the *General Assembly* (I suppose he means that in 1638.) did not throw out the *Bishops without the Authority of Parliament*, since they had their allowance for it; as if the *General Assembly* that threw out the *Bishops* had waited for the determination of a Parliament: and when Sir *George* pleads, that the *Ecclesiastick State* were always the first of the *three Estates of Parliament*, your little *Man* tells us, in opposition to this, some Stories of *Monks* and *Culdees*, by which the *Church* was governed from the beginning of Christianity in *Scotland*.

Pag. 3.

Pag. 4.

But

But is this any thing to our purpose, when we plead, that by so many Laws and Parliamentary Constitutions, our *Bishops* make up the first of the *Three Estates of Parliament*; and which is more, those very Laws are not yet repealed, by which the *Ecclesiastick State* is declared to be the first. And tho in the days of the *Covenant*, when the *Bishops* were expelled by *Tumult and Violence*, one of the *three Estates* was split into two, contrary to the fundamental Constitution of Parliaments, yet by unrepealed Laws and immemorial Possession, they remain the first of the *three Estates of Parliament*. He tells us next, that *there were no Bishops during King James's Residence, and consequently none sat in Parliament*; and must we be put to the drudgery of confuting such a sad Creature as this is, when the Records of Parliament give him the lie? And I speak it sincerely, I never saw any thing in Print more ignorantly writ than that Pamphlet is: for he tells us again, that *he knew of no Persons of Quality put to death by Covenanters, save the Earl of Montrofs.* And if you please to defend your learned Brother, you may; for my part, if I am not constrained to it, I am resolved never to look into his Pamphlet; nor do I know how to excuse my self at the Reader's hands, for inserting so many of his lamentable Impertinencies.

In another place of your Book, you accuse Sir *George Mackenzie* of having persecuted *Hallside*; but this Gentleman is here also, and no Man can speak more to the advantage of Sir *George Mackenzie*, in all Companies, and upon all occasions, than he does; and he flatly denies all the malicious Fictions that you have heaped together on that Subje&t.

If Laws have been made under the Reign of King *Charles II*, to restrain the Fury of Madmen and Incendiaries; neither the State, nor such as advised those Laws to be made are to be blamed; for there were no Laws made against the *Speculations* of Presbyterians, but against the Practices of such of them, whose *Principles* and *Endeavours* were equally destructive to humane Society, as they were pernicious to the particular Settlement of our Nation.

The Paragraph that follows is a true sample of your way of reasoning, when you say that *Nero* and *Julian the Apostate* had the Advantage of the *Primitive Christians*, in regard of *Quality, Sense, and Interest*. But I still think that the *Apostles* and *Primitive Christians* were Men of the best Sense, and far beyond all their Persecutors. Mr. *Ridpath*, to do you no piece of Injustice (for I disdain it, and one needs not take any Advantage of you) I let the Reader know, that in the Correction of your *Errata's*, you advise

Ibid.

Pag. 5.

Ibid.

to dash out the word *Sense* out of lin. 32. of pag. 27. but then when the word *Sense* is dashed out, you do not repeat faithfully the Doctor's Argument: for you know very well that he reckons the *Quality, Sense and Interest* of the Nobility that are for Episcopacy, as things that beat down the noise and clamour of all their Antagonists; you may raise *Monsters* as many as you please, and then fight with your own *Dreams and Imaginations*; but since you do not repeat an argument faithfully, you should let it alone. And what followed in the same Paragraph of the Postscript, *viz.* That the *Episcopal Nobility* were *men of parts, honour and integrity*, was to be considered in conjunction with the former; the Characters last named you do not deny to be true, and if so, how can *men of honour and integrity* be *perjured oppressors*? For my part, I never thought that Honour in its true notion could be separated from a good Conscience: and the Author of the Postscript intended to baffle the Calumnies of their opposers, by a compendious enumeration of the outward and inward advantages that the Patrons of Episcopacy possessed; so that if you was at the pains to answer this Argument, you ought not fraudulently to suppress such words, as contained its frame and energy: and I am content that you call me as well as the Author of the Postscript, a *Pedant, an Ass, a Blunderer, a Villain, a Lyar, and a Papist*; if I tell you that you seem to have nothing in your view than to raise a little Dust, when you repeat an argument but not in the Authors words, it is no more his but yours; you may be taught your mistake by that of the Poet,

*Quem recitas meus est O' fidentine Libellus
Sed male dum recitas incipit esse tuus.*

Pag 28.

You tell us next, that Sir George Mackenzie owns, that *Presbyterian Ministers, and Presbyterian Jurors* who were summoned to the tryal of *Malefactors* of their own persuasion, seldom failed to condemn them; From this you conclude, that Sir George gives himself and the Dr. both the *Lye*, when they charge those Principles upon the *Presbyterians* in general: and this you say, *discovers the falsehood of that necessity, that the Episcopilians pretend the Government was under to make such Laws against the Presbyterians in its own defence*. Your argument may be reduced into form thus: Some *Presbyterian Ministers* who lived peaceably at *Edinburgh*, blamed and condemned the practices and rebellions of the *Cameronian Presbyterians*: *Ergo, the principles of Rebellion are not to be charged upon the Scotch Presbyterians in general*. But Mr. Rid-

patb,

path, here I deny your *Consequence*. For when we charge the *Presbyterians* in general with rebellious *principles* and practices, we do not intend to include every individual of that persuasion; for many of them do not see the just consequences of their own *Principles*, many of them have not courage enough to put them in execution: many of them may be naturally of so sweet a temper, that the felicity of their complexion resists the malignity of their *Tenents*; yet notwithstanding of all this, the *Presbyterians* for the most part are guided by a Spirit of rebellion and ill nature. When one says such a thing is true of such a *Sect* or *Fraternity*; generally speaking, he does not intend that it should be understood in a strict universality, but with that latitude that the subject matter will allow; and if you say, that the severe *Laws* that you complain of were made against such *Malefactors*, as *Presbyterian Ministers* themselves *condemned*; then I infer, that the *Laws* were not made against *Presbyterians* as such, but against those *Rebels* who improved their *Covenants* and *Associations* into *Seditions*, *Tumults*, and *Insurrections*.

'Tis very true, that those *Presbyterian Ministers* who were of a calmer temper, were sometimes employed to reclaim the *Malefactors* to their Duty, yet they could not prevail with them, because the *Western Embusists* had a higher opinion of their own *Preachers*, who were *Remonstrators* and through paced *Covenanters*, than they had of the more peaceable and sober *Presbyterians*; why then are our *Laws* and *Governours* blamed for restraining the madnes of such who were thought intolerable by *Presbyterians* as well as by the *King* and *Parliament*, and your reasonings in this Paragraph plainly infer, that the *King* had nothing in his view but to preserve his hereditary Right, and the peace of his Subjects, when such and such *Laws* were made against illegal and tumultuous meetings, as men of all persuasions were necessitated to condemn.

But you add further, that this concession of *Sir George Mackenzie's*, *discovers the falsehood of that necessity which the Episcopalian* pretend the *Government was under, to make such Laws* against *Presbyterians in their own defence*. Mr. *Ridpath*, if the *Government* was assaulted, and the peace openly disturbed, there was a plain necessity to make such *Laws* as were thought proper to restrain the fury of such *Zealots*, whether they were *Presbyterians* or *Anabaptists*, all is one to me; and if you say that *Presbyterians* were not guilty of such practices, then I say there were no *Laws* made against the *Presbyterians*: for the *King* and *Parliament* did not consider them as *Presbyterians* but as heady, incorrigible, and stubborn *Rebels*,

Ibid.

Ibid.

Rebels, who were restless in their nature, and gave them perpetual disturbance.

Ibid.

What follows is of the same nature with the former; You tell us that Sir George says, that the hereditary Sheriffs refused to put the Laws in execution against Conventicles, by which they became formidable. This you pretend destroys two other Assertions propagated by our Party, viz. That *Presbyterianism* is not popular, and that none but the Rabble are their friends. But Mr. Ridpath, all this proceeds from your incurable, precipitancy and ignorance. For some heritable Sheriffs might be inclined to favour Presbytery, and yet 'tis very true, that the most of their friends are among the Rabble; and when we say so, we do not intend to say, but that here and there an heritable Sheriff, or a Gentleman, may be a stiff Covenanter, and may differ very little in his Education and principles, from the inferior sort of people, and if at any time we say that the Rabble only favours the Presbyterians, we understand that *Proposition* in a limited sense, as all such Propositions must be understood, for generally speaking (except it be in the West of Scotland) the *Presbyterians* have very few Friends among the *Nobility* or *Gentry*; and though they had not the majority of the Nation, yet they might prove formidable, and when Sir George says that they were formidable, can you infer from it that they were more numerous than their opposites. At this rate you may prove, that *High waymen*, and *Robbers* are more numerous than honest *Citizens* and *Subjects*, because a very few of them are able to frighten a whole *County*.

We are ever and anon told by you and the rest of your Party, that the *Majority of Scotland is for Presbytery*; but the wiser men of your Faction think otherwise, and therefore they took care to secure their *inclosure* (into which they stumbled by a fortuitous concourse of many accidents) by several Laws and barricadoes not to be named in this place.

Ibid.

When you recollect your self a little, perhaps you may acknowledge that it is not wisely done of you to abuse so many of the *Nobility of Scotland*, by such infamous Lyes and Forgeries as you are pleased to print, particularly when you tell us, That the *Court employed bloody, cut-throat Papists to ruine the Country*. You name the *Earl of Airlie*, and the *Laird of Meldrum*; 'tis true, this may pass in a *Coffee-house at London* where the *Earl of Air-gile* is not known; but there is not a Scots-man alive that ever heard that either of these Gentlemen were Papists. Now this is very sad stuff Mr. Ridpath, and any man that undergoes the toil of

of considering your Books, if he knew not whence they came, must be guarded by extraordinary patience, when truth and innocence are almost in every line so boldly invaded.

What you mean when you tell the Dr. that he has wounded Pag. 29.
his pretences to Loyalty by defending Sir George Mackenzie's Book,
 is to me a Mystery; for I am confident that you are but very
 little acquainted with him or his pretences either. But you com-
 plain that he did not answer your argument taken from the *con-*
sequences of Passive Obedience, and that he turns his back and takes
 no notice of you. Well, Mr. Ridpath, it is but just that a person
 of your valour should be met in open Field; but you must not
 conclude that a man is pusillanimous when he retires, unless you
 have him so much under your authority that he dare not move a
 step without your order, nor answer any thing unless in the method
 that you appoint him.

Ibid.

You impute all the direful effects of Arbitrary Power, to the
 Episcopal Party and the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*; yet I am
 apt to believe, that there is no people in the World loves Arbit-
 rary Power so much as the *Presbyterians* do, and that they hate
 it only when it is not in their own keeping. If by *Arbitrary*
 Power the *Presbyterians* mean some such power as is unaccountable
 to any earthly Tribunal, such a power there must be in every
 Government, and if it be not managed by a true Christian pub-
 lick Spirit, it may be as grievous and intolerable in the hands of
 a Parliament, as in the hands of a King. To declaim against
arbitrary power, is to declaim against all Government; for there
 is no Government upon Earth but exercises in its Supreme Judi-
 catories *arbitrary power* and jurisdiction, for which it is not ac-
 countable to any but to God alone, where this finally *decisive* and
 Supreme power ought to be lodged, is a Question that I leave to
Lawyers and Statesmen; they know our municipal Laws and Con-
 stitutions. When the sins of a Nation provoke God, then he pun-
 ishes them by foolish, extravagant, and cruel *Magistrates*; when
 it is otherwise, and that God is pleased with them, they enjoy
 good Laws, peace and protection under wise *Governours*; and
 this is all the remedy that is left in humane affairs, against publick
 calamities and disasters. There was no *Meeting* since the World
 began that declaimed against *arbitrary power* so much as the
long Parliament did, nor was ever *England* so miserable as under
 their Tyranny and Oppressions; as long as the administration of
 publick affairs is left to the disposal of men, so long we may
 be

be exposed to *arbitrary power*; and the former must be as long as the World continues: a *Parliament* may be as *tyrannical* as any *King*; and when *they* are thus pack'd together to serve a particular design, we must truckle under them until those *Laws* are repealed by another; so that *Passive Obedience* thus stated, is necessary under all Forms and Models of Government; it is all one thing to me whether I am oppressed by the *King*, or by *King* and *Parliament*; there is no *Judicatory* allows the remedy of a *Rebellion*, and what all *Judges* determine in all *Nations*, and at all times, *must be the Voice of God*.

They who plead for the Supreme and *decisive Authority* of the *General Assembly* in *Ecclesiastical* affairs, ought to be more friendly to *Arbitrary power*; for though their sentence against any particular *Clergyman* were never so unjust and oppressive, yet he must strike *Sail* and hold his *peace*, and practice *Non Resistance* to a greater heighth, than ever the *Episcopal Clergy* preached it, if he would not incur the highest *Cenitures* of the *Kirk*. And this *Spiritual Tyranny* is more insupportable, than that which reaches only our *temporal* concerns; and I am content without any blustering or foaming to reason this modestly with your self, or any other that you can name, but still with this *proviso*, that there be many more present than you and I, for I am afraid that we do not well understand one another, and therefore, if ever we meet we must have a *Moderator* to keep the *peace*.

pag. 30. You say that the Dr. contradicts himself, because he thought that there was no injury done to the *Presbyterians*, in publishing a Book that exposed their *Fooleries*; and yet he grants, that the Author of that Book *was perhaps unwary as to some instances*. Good Mr. *Ridpath*, I see no contradiction here at all, for a Book may serve the end for which it was published, though perhaps the Author mistakes himself in some single instances. There is no Author now adays sets up for an infallible *Dictator*; and you tell us in another place of your last *Pamphlet*, that it is not possible to publish so many particular stories without committing some faults; there is no doubt but you have a very good opinion of your own Book that you last printed, yet I hope you are convinced before now, that *the Covenant was imposed upon Children when they entred the University*. Whether the Author of that Book mistook himself or not, is not positively affirmed by the Dr. so your contradiction vanishes into air and noise. You raise more dust than a *Coach and six Horses*, when you are about to kill a *Fly*.

It is probable that the Author of the Postscript may be chastised for having said that Mr. Rutherford's Writings, in some places were past all human understanding. I have no commission from him or any of his Friends to return your Language in *Specie*. You tell us, that if Mr. Rutherford were alive, he would have scorned to have fouled his Fingers with such an Episcopal Hawker ; but indeed, Mr. Ridpath, I do not think that Mr. Rutherford was so proud, but that some time or other, he fouled his Fingers with meaner Creatures than the Doctor. But what was it that he said of Mr. Rutherford's Writings? that, *in some places they were very dark and obscure* ; and was this any such extraordinary Crime? Mr. Ridpath, I love to say very little of Men that are dead, if you think that his Writings are so clear, pray give us your Commentaries upon his second Chapter of his second Exercitation *Pro divina Gratia*. 2. Resp. *Distinguo vocem* (verum) *quod unusquisque tenetur credere, id est, verum, metaphysicè* & *fundamentaliter, in se & quoad eventum, concedo majorem & tum minorem pernego*. But still he left us to guess what the other Member of the Distinction may be. Therefore take it thus, *Quod unusquisque tenetur credere, id est, verum, logicè, formaliter, extra se, & quoad non eventum; nego Majorem*. And then both the one and the other are good strong Noniens in all its formalities. But he goes on, *Christum enim pro unoquoque mortuum esse in se fundamentaliter & metaphysicè, non est verum sed falsum*. *Christum pro unoquoque Mortuum esse metaphysicè falsum*, is a Phrase I am not acquainted with ; and if one durst speak it, the Author seems not, (notwithstanding of all the Flights of his Metaphysicks) to advert to the trite distinction between the *Veritas Metaphysica* and the *Veritas Logica*. For *Veritas Metaphysica numeratur inter proprietates Entis, & consequenter non objectum fidei sed simplicis apprehensionis* ; at propositionibus logicè *veris assentimur vel propter testantis auctoritatem, vel propter rei evidentiā* : And the Question is not *de Metaphysica veritate hujus propositionis, sed de veritate Logica*. This is not the only Instance that may be pick'd out of this Paragraph to prove it *obscure* and *unintelligible* ; that other Phrase *in se & quoad eventum concedo Majorem*, is as dark as any thing can be ; nor do I remark here the Solecism of his *Latin, quoad Eventum* ; but I name this *Exercitation* as *unintelligible* from the beginning to the end. And because you are a Man of honour, and cannot endure Contradiction with any Patience, it were a more gallant Exercize for you to prove that this *Exercitation* of his, is plain and solid Theology, than to blot so much Paper with your imaginary Libels against the Clergy. You fight much at the rate that the *Tartars* do, when they are driven before their

Enemies ; or rather like the *Dutch*, who are mounted on Horseback that they may fly with greater Convenience : but if you have as much Courage and Honour, as you have Bawling and Impudence, come to a close Engagement, and prove that Mr. Rutherford's Answers to the forementioned Argument are solid, plain and intelligible. What miraculous Feats other *Presbyterians* can do, is nothing to your purpose. Add to the former Instance Mr. Rutherford's Argument in his 22. Chapter of his *Disputatio Scholastica de divina Providentia*, to prove that there is no opposition between Sin and the Divine Nature, which I cannot now transcribe, and yet still I have the Confidence to say that it is foolish, childish and frivolous, and of the most pernicious consequence upon the Morals of Mankind. For if there is no opposition between the Divine Nature and Sin, *antecedenter ad liberum DEI decretum*, Men may be brought to think that Sin is not so odious in it self, nor at so great a distance from true Perfection, as the Scriptures represent it. But if you would see many more passages that are unintelligible, read his *Disquisitiones de Ente possibili*, and the former *Exercitation*, and if any thing can convince you, you may be then forced to acknowledge that his Writings are obscure, and consequently the Doctor's saying so did not furnish you with the least umbrage of charging Sir George Mackenzie with the grossest Immoralities of Life, for such I think the subornation of Witnesses is.

Pag. 32.

The next Blow is for his Incivility to Mr. *Rule*, that *he does not allow him the Title of Doctor*. Truly, Mr. *Ridpath*, if he wilfully made use of any other Complement towards him, than what is just, there is no Man alive more ready to retract his Error than he ; he thought there was no rudeness in bestowing upon him the Title by which he was ordinarily known ; and if the Doctor knew not the several steps of his Promotion, I see no reason why you can accuse him of Incivility, and the thing being purely indifferent ; if he had been better informed, he would not deny any thing that he knew to be so easie and innocent.

Next you tell us that you do not believe the two instances that are cited in that Postscript against Mr. *Rule* upon the Doctor's Authority. But why, Mr. *Ridpath*, did the Author say so of him barely upon his own Authority, or are they not to be seen both of them in his Printed Books ; and are not you much more uncivil to him, who revive Stories when perhaps they are entirely forgotten by others ? The *decretum prædamnatum* was not the Fiction of my Friend, nor yet his new and unaccountable *Criticism* of the word *Ordinatio* ; and now you may add another, which is *decretum præteritum*.

teritum. And you may see these new *Decrees* (never mentioned before by any Class of *Divines*) in page 66 of his *Vindication of the Church of Scotland*. And now I think one is sufficiently provoked to call you impudent, that you bring above-board things that you neither understand nor defend.

You complained, in your former Pamphlet of the Injuries done to Mr. Urquhart and Mr. Kirkton; because the first was said to have spoken contemptuously of our *Blessed Saviour* and the *Lord's Prayer*, and the other alledged, that *Abraham run out of the Land of Chaldea for debt*. The Author of the Postscript told you that both these Stories (which you your self thought unpardonable) could be proved; and I am confident many more of that nature. But you tell us that *you are sufficiently satisfied, by those who have lately made enquiry into the Affair, that the whole is a malicious Calumny*. So we must take it upon your Word and theirs, it might be reasonably expected from you, that, at least, you would have procured under their own hands solemn Attestations that they never said any such thing; and that was all that you could do to prove your *Negative*: and this might have been easily had, especially from Mr. J. K. who lives at *Edinburgh*; nor is there any of us so far exasperated against him as not to believe his own Testimony solemnly and seriously delivered. And this is more Civility on our part, than any of them will allow us at any time, or upon any occasion. If I were at *Edinburgh* I could prove the *Affirmative*; and you must excuse me to continue just where I was, notwithstanding of all the Informations you have received.

The following Paragraph hath in it more Impertinencies than there are Lines, and yet it is probable that many of your Sect may think it *seraphically witty*. The Author of the Postscript said, that *the absurd and ludicrous Sect metamorphos'd Religion and its solemn Exercises into Theatrical Scenes*. Another of the same Fraternity says, that *your Preachers were whining Fellows that drivelled at Mouth and Eyes*. And thus you make them contradict one another, and then you run away with a loud *holla'a*, as if you were at the Head of the Rabble pulling down a Cathedral, to see so many *Curates slain with the Jaw bone of an A/s*. The word *Theatrical Scenes* does not determine whether your Preachers acted *Comedies* or *Tragedies*, and a whining *Scaramouchi* may act his part in either; and if so, the many Words, which you have gathered to no purpose, discover your Ignorance, and not any Contradiction amongit them whom you hate. But, Mr. Ridpath, are you not in a strange Career when you can never hit upon the true nature of a Contradiction;

no 1411. 1715

I am not surpriz'd that you do not know the Nature of a Comedy and Tragedy, for you never read *Aristotle* ~~as this will tell you~~, nor none of the Commentators upon him, either ancient or modern; yet you might, in two months time (for so long I am told you was at the University) have learned what a strict and formal Contradiction is.

That the Presbyterians were better at Libelling than their Neighbours, is evident from all Records; and therefore the Author of the Postscript had good Reason to say, that *Libelling* was their *Characteristick*, as that which they most practised, and excelled all others in; that, in which they placed most of their Strength and Confidence, and which they will never forbear, if they happen to live where there is any to be accused. But you say that *your Enemies were the first Aggressors*, and their bold Attempts against the Godly, justifies all the rough Treatment that they have met with. Mr. Ridpath, there is one thing that I would entreat you to condescend to, and it is, in itself, very just and reasonable, and unless you yield to it, we may fight to our last breath without satisfying one another or serving any good Design, the thing is this, when you accuse Persons and Parties, you must be more express, definite and particular in your Libels. I am of the Opinion that it is not possible for Presbyterians to forbear Libelling, especially upon all publick Turns and Revolutions; their Libels against the Clergy both in *England* and in *Scotland*, are still upon Record. Did you never see the *Centuries of scandalous Ministers* accused before the *Long-Parliament*. The General Libel against the *Bishops of Scotland* may be seen, when you please, in the *King's Large Manifesto*, and in the *first Volume of Nalson's Collections*, and if you believe neither of these Books, since they were both written by *Malignants*, read the *Acts of the General Assembly, 1638*, and there you have the very same Libels mentioned; and there is no Presbyterian but knows, that the Libels against the Bishops, in the Year 1638, were read from all the Pulpits of the Nation where the *Assembly's Authority* was obeyed: and what is said, by the Author of the Postscript, of their Behaviour towards *Archbishop Spotswood*, is commonly attested by the oldest Men in that corner of the Country, near *St. Andrews*. Particularly this is more carefully preserved in the Family of *Balfour*. And the *Bishop of O.* and *Mr. Sage of Glasgow*, had this very Story from the *Laird of Balfour's* own mouth. 'Tis true that there is an *Act of the General Assembly*, mentioning the *Libels* against the *Bishops*, but there are also among the unprinted *Acts*, *Acts of Excommunication and Deposition against some Prelates*; and when

when those Acts are produced, I offer to prove, from their own Authentick Records, many more steps of their Fraud and Artifice. That there are such Acts as I last named unprinted, vid. *Index of the principal unprinted Acts of the Assembly at Glasgow, 1638.* And if they were not afraid of being discovered and exposed, upon this very Head, those Acts had been printed as well as the other *Principal Acts*; nay, the Act against *Episcopacy* it self was not printed, because it could not but alarm all the *Protestant Churches* abroad against them, when the Order of *Episcopacy* was condemned as *simpliciter unlawful*; a thing unheard in the Christian Church, until the mungrel Conventicle at *Glasgow* sat: therefore the Act against *Episcopacy* was left unprinted as well as the Acts of *Excommunication and Deposition* against some *Prelates*. And this is either altogether unknown to, or dissembled by Mr. Gilb. Rule, when he denies the Truth of that Story, as related by the Author of the *Five Letters*. And you are a Fool to think, that, in those days, when Rebellion and Hypocrisie were triumphant, they would have stuck at such little Punctilio's, and not practise all Arts to delude the Populace. I hope you do not deny what use they made of *Margaret Mitchelson's* *Visions*, *Raptures* and *Revelations*, by which they perswaded the People that the Covenant was authorised by immediate *Revelations* from Heaven, as well as by the Popular *Tumults* at *Edinburgh*. The Knavery against *Archbishop Spotswood* was an Injury done to him and the Church; but the counterfeit *Raptures* of *Margaret Mitchelson* (countenanced by your Party) mocked and defied God's Justice and Providence, no less than it ridicul'd and prophan'd all Religion. [Vid. *King's large Declaration.*] Nay, they procured Libels against the Clergy from most *Counties* in *England*; and in those *Counties* where they had none to work upon of their own Gang, they forged Libels, and presented such counterfeit Petitions in the name of such *Counties*, and dispersed their Forgeries for real Truths, to make their Party appear numerous, and the * Clergy odious. And Sir *Thomas Afton* pe-^{* Nals.} *titioned the House of Lords* against this villainous Practice; but this *Coll. 1.* was not welcome to those *Lords* who favoured the Faction, and Vol. pag. therefore Sir *Thomas Afton* was repreahended, and the *Forgerers* gently 795. rebuked. And my Author truly observes, that this was like to prove *aglorious Reformation*, which was built upon such Foundations, and advanced by such Arts and Methods. So that if you mean the former Presbyterians, they were the first Aggressors; and if you mean the modern, they practised this Trade of Libelling ever since the beginning of

of the Revolution, and long before the Book appeared that provoked your displeasure, and they are much better at it than their opposites; their curiosity reaches to the meanest concerns. There are no people in the World can give such exact account of their Neighbours, *when they rise*, and *when they go to bed*, what they eat, and what they drink, what they say, and with whom they converse; and this is the reason why they so often blow up the neighbourhood into flames of Contention and Calumny. Name me but one Man since the name of *Presbyterians* was known to the World, that ever gave them any sensible provocation, whom they have not persecuted with their Tongues and Libels to the utmost of their power.

They were not only the first Aggressors, but they continued their practices under the Reign of *Charles II.* and since the Revolution the Libels against the Clergy have employed their Presbyteries, Synods, and Assemblies, not to mention the Libels against *Masters of Universities*, where there was no Accuser. I have insisted the longer upon this, to let you see the vanity of a common topick that runs through both your Pamphlets; Libelling is so peculiar to the *Presbyterians*, that they cannot think of reforming it; in all their conversations their discourse runs most upon them that are absent. It is an idle thing to deny plain matter of Fact, especially when it is supported by publick Records, Practices, and the unanimous Suffrages of a whole Nation. I think it enough to prove by the most undeniable evidence, that in this art of Libelling you are the first aggressors, and the only experienced practitioners, without putting my self to the pains of calling you *Rogue*, *Villain*, *Rascal*, *impudent Lyar*, and such like gentile names as you bestow upon your Adversaries.

Pag. 33. You add, *That it is natural for a Cadet of Dumbarton's Regiment, which used to plunder people of their goods, to rob Men of their good Names*, and therefore *ought not to be believed*. This is a new Article which we have not heard of before, that he *plundered people of their goods*, and it supplies the defects of the Original Libel in the *Inquisition*; and it is very ordinary for the *Presbyterians* to represent such as they Libel, actually guilty of the breach of the *Ten Commandments*: Now Your *Woman amongst the Corn*, and the *plundering people of their goods*, added to the former Libel makes him actually guilty of the breach of all. For in the first Libel, He is accused of having *no Religion*, and of *Swearing*, so at one stroke he transgresses the *first four*; and the two Articles added in

your

your *Continuation*, together with his *Reflections against the Presbyterians* make him guilty of the rest, either expressly or by necessary consequence. But Mr. *Ridpath*, you do not know the discipline of the *French Army*, and if he had inclinations to rob and plunder, this is a more proper time to practise it ; when *He* is turned out of all his Possessions, and allowed no other employment under this Reformation than to answer *Libels*. And indeed I think if you were a Soldier, you have no principle to restrain you from plundering when you might venture with safety, especially in a *Popish Country*, the true *Israelites*, and *Covenanters* might take the *Egyptian goods* without scruple or remorse ; as they formerly did at *New-Castle*, contrary to Articles and Capitulations.

Your Grammatical Lecture of the *Literæ Mutabiles*, you may recommend to your Scholars, and whatever proficiency you have made in Grammar, you seem to me to reason much like the Gentleman that I formerly named, who thought himself of *Ovid's Family*.

You had better let fall the mention of *Archbishop Sharp*, than bring him so often upon the Stage to the disgrace of your Party. *He* was certainly murdered, not by an accidental effort of fury and passion as you alledge ; but in a most deliberate manner, after many Cabals and consultations kept for that very end ; and the Author of the *Postscript* did not reason from *Shields* his authority so much as from the Principles he went upon, his Book being an accurate Collection of several authentick Papers, and avowed practices of his Party since the *Reformation* ; nor was it ever said, that sober *Presbyterians* did allow of *his Murder* : but how few of them are sober ? and I can tell you more, that the *Presbyterian Ladies in Fife* at that very time, did industriously shun in all conversation to call this *bloody Act*, a *Murder* ; but gravely said, that *indeed the Man was slain*, but they could not think that any thing that was performed by so great a *Saint* as *Ratbillat* and his religious Cut-throats, could be called a *Murder*. And when such practices are charged upon the *Presbyterians* in general, it is not intended (as I told you once already) to involve every individual ; it is not possible to deprave the nature of some particular men to that degree, though they seem to maintain principles that yield pernicious Consequences.

Ibid.

Ibid.

But, Mr. Ridpath, by conversing with your self I am become a little more bold, and I offer to prove from Presbyterian principles, that *Archbishop Sharp* ought to have been murdered, are not all the Covenanters obliged to bring their *Enemies to condign punishment*? and when the Magistrates are open and avowed Enemies to the cause of God, is it not lawful for some to interpose? especially when acted by Heroical impulse to stop the universal deluge of Impiety, that was likely to drown the whole Nation, to recover the freedom of the *Church* that was run down by Tyranny and Perjury, contrary to all National Obligations, former Laws and Liberties. Did not King *Charles II.* himself know *, that *he had forfeited his Title to the Crown*? and was it necessary according to you to delay the execution of Justice in this calamitous posture of publick affairs, unless it could be procured in due form? when it was not possible for honest men to be heard: especially since the Covenanters struck off the heads of *Montrose*, *Huntley*, *Haddo*, *Spotswood*, for acting by a Commission from the very King, by whose Commission they themselves pretended to hold their places. What is there in the Murder of *Archbishop Sharp* that may not be justified by your Principles? Did not *He* deserve death? No doubt you think he did; and if it be only the Forms that you stand upon, must the seasonable execution of Justice be delayed, because it cannot be had in all its regular steps and formalities, when the Magistrates openly tyrannize and oppres our Liberties Civil and Religious? At this rate you disown the most publick acts of the *Covenanters*. By what form of Law then in being, did the *Tables* of your Govenanters sit at *Edinburgh*, when they were forbidden by open Proclamation to continue any longer their Consultations and Cabals. If you pretend the necessity of their affairs, was there ever any state of things more lamentable in it self, than you represent the Reign of King *Charles II.* to be? and if so, why might not some resolute and gallant *Heroes*, some true *Sons of the Covenant*, venture, without the ordinary forms, to do justice speedily upon such an eminent opposer of Religion as *Archbishop Sharp* was? The Laws of self-defence and preservation, as you explain them, dispence with Forms, when the thing is for the matter right in itself, and the Magistrate not only neglects, but avowedly opposes Truth, Justice, and Innocence; then 'tis time for men of Courage and Resolution to step forth and assert their Religion and Liberties, not

* Contin-
nuat.

not by the tedious method of Law, Order and Process, when *Covenants and Original Contracts* are turned *topsy turvy*, but speedily and by open Force pull *Aniechrist* from the Throne. Mr. *Ridpath*, be advised by me, do not stand so much upon Forms; else you must part with your best beloved Principle and *Covenanted Reformation*.

And if the Murder of Archbishop *Sharp* be sincerely disowned by the *Presbyterians*, since they are so often upbraided and reproached with it; why do not they by some solemn Act of their Assembly declare, that the killing of *Cardinal Beaton* and Archbishop *Sharp* were villainous Murders? tho the first was ushered in by Prayer, and the other by singing of Psalms.

You oppose your own Authority to Mr. *Shields*, and this I am sure many of your own party will laugh at; whether you have the Ascendent of the Doctor in the point of *Philosophy*, I will give you my Thoughts of that before I end this Letter.

The Doctrine of *Passive Obedience* comes again in your way, Pag. 34.
and nothing is more odious to so brisk and daring a Spirit as the very thought of so tame and silly a Discipline; and you refer us to the incomparable Argument lately published by Mr. *Johnson*. Mr. *Ridpath*, I agree with you, that the Preface of Mr. *Johnson*'s Book hath in it very pleasant Stroaks of Wit and Fancy; but as to the argumentative part of his Book, it proves the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience* to be *Heterodox*, by an Argument of equal Strength with that of your own, by which you prove the *Episcopal Clergy* to be *Enthusiasts*.

You tell us next, that his Defences of Mr. *Brown* and Mr. *Cant*, are so like a *Pedantick Doctor*, that they deserve no regard, and what you said of them you can bring the Authors to avow it to their Faces. Now we fall upon the Common-place of *Pedantry*; and, Mr. *Ridpath*, you must understand that there are *Pedants* in all Employments. If the vanity of appearing learned and knowing where there is no solid Foundation to support the Character deserve that Name, perhaps the citing so many *Logical Axioms* in your Pamphlet, which you do not at all understand, may, in the Opinion of some, make you pass for a *Pedant*. But, to let this go, tho the Doctor's being a *Cadet* in *Dumbarton*'s Regiment, was not, in your Opinion, an auspicious *Omen* of Piety and Humanity, yet one might think it a good Presage of his Freedom from *Pedantry*, at least as good as any of your most remarkable Adventures in my Lord *Wh-ton*'s Kitchin. F The

The Doctor said, that Mr. George Brown, Minister of Drysdale, processed Andrew Johnston of Lockerby, *vigorously before the Ecclesiastical Court for his Crime of Adultery*, and therefore his alledged connivance was a *Presbyterian Forgery*. And here the *Affirmative* was his, which I prove by the following Certificate under the hands of four Witnesses ; two in the Parish of St. Margaret's Westminster, another in *Cornhill* near the *Exchange*, and the fourth without *Aldersgate*.

WE whose Names are underwritten, hereby testify and declare, upon Honour and Conscience, that, to our certain knowledge, Mr. George Brown, Minister of Drysdale in the Diocese of Glasgow, processed Andrew Johnston of Lockerby so vigorously, for his Crime of Adultery with Sarah Brown, that he got him formally excommunicated. Given under our Hands at London the Fourth of July, 1693. A. Guthrie, Andr. Johnston, Tho. Mitchell, Alex. Johnston.

Now, Mr. Ridpath, where lies the *Pedantry* in saying so and so of Mr. Brown ; is not your Accusation against him proved to be a *Lie*? And as for your Charge against Mr. Andrew Cane, that he was suspended, &c. it is purely a *Fiction* from top to bottom ; we cannot prove a *Negative* otherwise than by informing the World that we who are his most intimate Acquaintances never heard of any such thing ; he was never suspended, and consequently never used any mean Arts to ingratiate himself with his Superiours, the first is a *Romance*, and therefore the Superstructure must be a *Forgery*. And when you charge the Doctor with *Pedantry*, read over your own learned Book of the Sufferings of Presbyterians from the *Episcopalians*, especially your nasty and fulsome Epithets

that you bestow upon such as you bark at, *viz.* that they are *Tyranno-Papa-Prelatical*, and then let any impartial Reader judge whether you do not deserve a place *ante omnem circulum* amongst the *Pedants*. There is nothing in all the *Athenian Flexions and Compositions*, like that High and Majestick Word, *Tyranno-Papa-Prelatical*. 'Tis worthy of the noble Mr. Ridpath's high flown *Genius*; and if you were on the top of a Hill in *Galloway*, preaching to a *Field-Meeting*, this one single Word would confound your *Auditors* into a belief that you were a *precious, gracious, convincing Man*.

Who could stand before so much Eloquence and Acuteness, *Bombakanachides, Clamenstarides archides in Campis Gurgustidoniis*.

The Author of the Postscript said; that you charged our *Superiours* Pag. 35. with such as were deposed for their *Immoralities*, as *Dean Hamilton*, and *Cockburn of St. Bothens*. To this you say, that you charged them only with having protected those *Men* from the *Punishment due to their Impieties*. But did they protect them when they were deposed? And how can you say that ever they were protected? If their *Superiors* waited for full and clear *Evidences* against them before they pronounced *Sentence*, here was no protection of *Criminals*, but *Obedience to the Laws*; and tho' your *Party* be not tied to *Forms*, yet we think our selves obliged to act as we are directed by the *Laws*.

You fall next upon *Archbishop Paterson*, and the *Lies* that you Pag. 36. have published formerly of *Archbishop Cairncross*, which are plainly refuted in his own printed *Letter*, to the *Conviction of all men*; *shews what credit you deserve when you accuse either of them*.

Mr. Ridpath, you think it a palpable *Blunder* to say, that *some who complied with Episcopacy after the Restoration of King Charles II. were Presbyterians*; and this is another sad *Instance* of your *Ignorance*; for they were required to do nothing inconsistent with the *Principles of moderate Presbyterians*; and all the *Ringleaders of the Covenanters*, had their *Mission* from the *Bishops of the Church of Scotland*, and do you think that they did not then conform to *Episcopacy*; or that they were not *Presbyterians*? I am afraid that the little *Club*, whereof you are *Moderator*, does not thoroughly understand the *Principles of Presbytery*. Had we no *Presbyterian Ministers in Scotland*, but such as deserted their *Churches* in the *West* after the *Restoration*? was it ever required of

Ibid.

any of them that conformed to *Episcopacy*, to assert that *Episcopacy* was preferable to a *Parity of Presbyters*? No ; they still enjoyed their own liberty of thinking what they pleased, if they obeyed their Superiors in *licitis & honestis*. Were not Mr. *Meldrum*, and Mr. *Wilkie*, and many others that I could name, Presbyterians, tho they conformed to *Episcopacy*? They themselves think that they were so still ; to my certain knowledge the last was, and I know him to be so honest a Man, that he never endeavoured to hide his Principles, and he thought that he did nothing in conforming to *Episcopacy*, inconsistent with his own Opinions, and he would have continued still in the Communion of the *Episcopal* Church if a later *Test* had not removed him. You must not think that all the Presbyterians are warmed to an equal degree of Heat : there are some, tho very few, more calm and solid than their younger Brethren. Read Mr. *Rutherford's due right of Presbytery* (and I cannot name a Book more acceptable) perhaps you may meet with some Notions there that are not so agreeable to the late Model of Presbytery ; the last Edition of a Book is still *annotation & emendation*. And if it was a Blunder to say, that some who continued Presbyterian in their Principles, conformed to the external Order of the Church under *Episcopacy*, they who did so conform are obliged to defend him.

Ibid.

You still oblige your Adversaries to prove *Negatives* ; when you libel Dr. *Canaries*, you tell us, that *two the Ministers and Judicators declared, that they could make nothing of the Accusation brought against him, yet that will not amount to prove it false* ; and because a *Negative* in matter of Fact is not demonstrated (a thing in it self absolutely impossible) you therefore conclude, that still you may accuse him as guilty ; but if nothing could be made of it why should you propagate or continue the Slander ? for not only are you destitute of true and solid Proofs, but all your Evidences, when they are aggravated by Presbyterian Malice, could never be heightened into a plausible Presumption of his Fault. If I should accuse you of having committed *Incest* with your *Mother*, you could not prove it to be false otherwise than by letting the World know, that *nothing could be made of it* ; and if so, no honest Man will defame you upon that head.

Ibid.

But you tell us, that *there is unexceptionable Evidence of the Woman's having declared the thing her self*. What thing her self declared I know not ; but for the unexceptionable Evidence, 'tis only upon

upon Record in the *World of the Moon*, else we had seen it in legible Characters long e'er now. But you tell us, that the reputation of your Informer is fairer than that of either of the two Dr's. Mr Ridpath, I do not know who this Gentleman is, and therefore in modesty I must forbear to make comparisons; but if he will preserve his Reputation, he must smother his Evidence.

What you drive at towards the close of this Section, is past my skill to find out; when you say, That we have a very pregnant instance of a Person of no mean Note, whose accusation, most in England are satisfied is true, and yet we see nothing can be made out, neither before the Judges nor the Lords. Mr. Ridpath, You leave it uncertain whether the Person of no mean Note be the Accuser or the Accused. But to demonstrate the impertinence of this Instance, and that you understand Law as little as you do the Rules of Logick. I put the case, that *Titius* accuses his wife *Mævia* of Adultery; the Judges may be persuaded that the accusation of *Titius* is true, though the evidences be not so full as the Law requires; yet being plain and positive in their nature, and but a degree removed from full proof; such presumptions of guilt which the Civilians call *præsumptiones juris & de jure*, leave deep impressions upon all, when duly conveyed to our knowledge: because they are as near as can be to that which is *plena probatio in foro*. But pray, have you any such presumptions against the Dr? Is there any plain evidence against him? and if nothing can be made of it as the Judicatories declare, then 'tis many degrees below a Presumption; much less that higher presumption which is the ground of a reasonable Suspicion.

But you add, that, Suppose the accusation against the Dr. to be false, yet it argues a great want of cleanly Men amongst the Episcopalians, that they should choose a Man for Agent who lay under a flagrant Scandal. The Apostle's Rule is clear, that a Bishop ought to be blameless. A surmise magnified by Presbyterian malice illustrates rather than darkens a man's Reputation, and clears his innocence; not to be evil spoken of by such whose Element is Calumny, is an argument of no great Spirit, and far less activity. But you say, that the Apostle's Rule is clear; I say so too, but your Head is not clear, because the Apostle says, that a Bishop ought to be blameless; therefore you conclude, that if Bishops at any time are evil spoken of and traduced, they must be no longer Bishops. At this rate the most innocent and de-

Ibid.

serving

Serving men must be disowned, and the greatest Luminaries of the Church must expect to be cashier'd. *Athanasius* was accused of abominable immoralities ; and St. John the Baptist was said to have a Devil ; and the Great Bishop of our Souls was accused of being a friend to Publicans and Sinners ; he went to Feasts and entertainments which the Puritanical Pharisee could not behold without grumbling and censuring ; they would quietly whisper in their Neighbours Ears, that though he said many good things, and wrought many Miracles, yet he was still a stranger to the power of Godliness ; he kept ill Company, and the Modern Phanaticks would add, that he was for forms of Prayer ; and a great many other things he did, that the Spirit of detraction took by the wrong handle. If your Commentary upon these words, *A Bishop ought to be blameless*, had appear'd before the Scotch Eloquence came abroad, it ought to have had its own room in that Book, *Corah, Dathan, and Abiram*, raised many Scandals, and they were Scandals of Prelacy and Priest-craft too, against Moses and Aaron ; and by your argument they ought both of them to have been deprived of their Honour and Government.

Pag 37.

The next mistake is as foolish and impertinent, though not so dangerous as your wresting the *Holy Scriptures* to serve the heats of your deluded Fancy. You tell us, that Dr. M—— o was very angry that you said of him, [commonly called Dr.] but I assure you, you mistook his meaning : he could not but remark a *Quaker* expression [commonly called] and so much the rather, that there are many *Presbyterians* who industriously shun the giving any such Title ; for those Academick distinctions look so near the *Whore of Babylon*, that it is not safe for the *Saints* to use such words ; and if the Dr. has any grains of Pride (which perhaps might be allowed in a Cadet of Dumbar-ton's Regiment) yet his ambition runs in another Channel than to affect *empty sounds* and big words. I thought (and I think I know him better than you do) that a *careless easiness* rather than *reserve, distance or singularity*, made up his Character ; the affectation of Titles at this time is very unsuitable to the *Scotch Clergy*, yet it is not in the power of might or malice to make some of them fawn upon the *Presbyterians* : and though we are obliged to forgive our *Enemies* heartily and sincerely, we must not be so abject as to encourage them to continue their Hostilities, but there is a greater impertinence in your Censure of the Dr; for

for when you made him to ride in the Popes Guards with a — to insinuate the many Crimes that he was guilty of at *Rome*, you conclude thus, which methinks looks somewhat strange that such kind of men should be the greatest sticklers for the Party. If you represent the Party as odious and irreligious, and him of the same temper with his Party; what is there strange in this, that an ill man should defend an ill cause: but the most ordinary things appear to you in your Dreams and Visions, Monsters, Miracles and Contradictions.

You are so sharp-sighted in discovering Contradictions, that you see them almost in every line; and because the Author of the Postscript said, that Dr. *Canaries* was treated with special Honour by a Presbyterian Judicature; therefore this is made a contradiction to what others say of them, that they are a *proud, sour, unconversible Tribe*. But this is your everlasting mistake, that you do not understand what a Contradiction is. That they are a *proud, sour, unconversible Tribe*, is true in the sense, that all such propositions are understood; not in a *Logical universal sense*, but generally speaking; the proudest Man upon Earth is not *sour and unconversible* in all the intervals of his life; Mad men have their *lucid intervals*, and a wise Man may sometimes act foolishly; *Solomon* says, *that a wise Man's heart is at his right hand*; yet the presence of his mind may sometimes forsake him, and he himself was a sad instance of this Truth; *His Proverbs*, that are *divinely inspired*, many of them are true in no other sense than *as èm tò πολù*; and is it not sad that the poor *Curates* should have no other employment now adays, than to dispute with such as know not the nature of a Contradiction; yet for your encouragement, I believe *George Stirling*, and *Harry Ferguson* may think you one of the learnedest men this last age has produced; and perhaps there is none beyond you in their Opinion already.

Your quartel against the Dr. is never at an end, and he expects no fairer quarter at your hands. You are angry it seems that he denied that ever he rode in the Pope's Guards; He denies it still, and he offers to prove this *Negative* as far as any thing of that nature can be proved, and he is still of the Opinion, that none knew him to have ridden in the Pope's Guards; but *Presbyterians* who discover plots in the *World of the Moon*. This last expression raises your indignation higher, because you say,

Ibid.

112

Ibid.

it bath in it an impudent hint of denying the late Prelatical Plots against the Government. And must he be impudent because he does not know the Plots against the Government? and how came you to know that there are no Plots in the *World of the Moon*? are you so well acquainted with the Inhabitants that you know exactly their times of Peace and War, the several Revolutions and Designs in that Country? for my part I know of no Plots against this or any other Government, and I never read your News-Letters, and I think that the great and dangerous *Plots* of which no man is found guilty, are all of them in the *World in the Moon*. *Presbyterians* are so well acquainted with plotting, that some of them cannot forget it no more than a *Few* can forget his Religion; they speak of *Plots* and *Designs*, they dream of them, they talk of them in all Companies; and if an innocent man steps aside to ask his Neighbour *what a clock it is*, he is immediately found in a *Plot* by some *Presbyterian Informer*.

But now, Mr. Ridpath, you fall into a fit of Devotion, and you wish that the *Falshoods* which have been mutually charged on one another, may oblige both to be more tender of publishing Reports upon trust. Alas! Mr. Ridpath, is it come to this, that you acknowledge that there have been Falshoods charged upon the Episcopal Party by the *Presbyterians*; no doubt a Man of your Tenderness and Sincerity regrets this infamous Practice; yet in the next Breath you tell us, that when the Doctor was Parson of —— *he was accused of Villany with a Woman amongst the Corn*. Such Stories are the very things that confirm me in the Opinion that your Tribe is so very well acquainted in the *World of the Moon*. Where was he *Parson* when he was accused? by whom was he accused? who heard of this Accusation before your scurrilous Pamphlet appeared? You do not say positively that he was guilty. No; you let it sneakingly drop thro your Fingers: so that the Question now between you and me is not whether *he* was guilty or not guilty; but whether accus'd or not accus'd. The *Affirmative* part is yours, and if an honest Man had it by the end he would either prove it or retract it; the *Negative* is mine that *he was never accused*, and if none of them amongst whom he lived, in the most eminent places of the Nation ever heard that he was thus accused, none but an impudent Liar will affirm it.

But if you were to speak your last, you can freely declare, that *you do not know one Syllable of what you write to be false*. At this rate, you may accuse him of all the Crimes that the *Presbyterians* invented against the *Bishops* in the Year 1638, as I have told you before when I mentioned the *Archbishop of Glasgow*; and of all

all the Crimes which your own Major *Wier* actually committed with *Mares*, *Cows* and *Cats*; not to name the Sisters that run with him from one Communion to another, for his extraordinary Gift of extempore Prayer; for after all, you may safely say, that you do not know them to be false; and if any should accuse Mr. *Ridpath* to have committed *Incest* with his Mother at *Cockburnspath*, before he went to the College of *Edinburgh*; I may safely say, that if I were to speak my last I do not know it to be false. And how should one know such *Negatives* in matter of Fact without *Omniscience*? and because you do not know such things to be false, you think you have liberty to spread and propagate romantick Lies, pure and unmixt Calumnies against particular Persons. Are these the Weapons by which you serve your Party? and do you think to impose upon the World by such *Bedlam Fooleries*?

But tho the Dr. was not in the Pope's Guards, yet he was a *Cadet* in *Dumbarton's Regiment* in *France*, and there is no such odds, you think, between being a *Cadet* in *Dumbarton's Regiment*, which guarded *Papery* and contributed so much to enslave Europe, and riding in the Pope's Guards. Yes, Mr. *Ridpath*, there is very great odds, tho you do not see it, as much as there is between the Liberties of the *Gallican Church*, and the *unlimited Supremacy of the Pope*: and do you think that the *King of France* was fighting for *Papery*, when he wrested the antient Rights of the *Regale* out of the possession of the *Roman Bishop*? But Mr. *Ridpath*, the Dr. was certainly in *Dumbarton's Regiment*, I assure you of it, and, which is much worse, he never thought shame of it. The strict Alliance between the liberal Sciences and Arms is a *Common-place* too well known, and he is very sure, that neither Scholar nor Gentleman will ever reproach him upon this head; and his passing some of his time in *France* (the great *Theatre of Breeding and Civility*) was a more auspicious *Omen of Piety and Humanity* than the most remarkable Gallantries of your Life. * *Plato* had strong Inclinations to follow the Camp when he was young, until he was diverted by the Advice of *Socrates*. I hear you sometimes teach *Grammar* (a Study in it self very commendable) why then do not you read our *Buchanan*, * *Ad Iulij Viri* *Car. Coss. Francia Maresch.* in *Jephth. Tragoed.* *Præf.* *Absurdam fortasse rem facere quibusdam videbor: qui ad te, hominem ab ineunte ætate militaribus imbutum studiis & inter arma Tubasque semper versatum munusculum hoc literarium mittam: sed si fere hoc absurdum existimaturis sunt qui aut harum rerum inter se consensionem non satis animadvertis* aut

aut ingenium tuum parum habent perspectum. Neque enim inter rei Militari & literariorum studium ea est quam plerique falsò putant discordia, sed summa potius concordia & occulta quædam naturæ conspiratio; quanquam enim superioribus aliquo seculis sive hominum inertia sive falsâ quædam persuasione divise fuerunt bæ. professores, nunquam tamen perversa imperitorum opinio tantum potuit ut ipse inter se veterem illam & naturalem (ut ita loquar) cognitionem obliviscerentur.

not to name any of the Antients; and if nothing else must please you but the Example of a *Presbyterian* of the latest Edition, why may not I justify the Dr's Practice, when he was very young, from the Example of your Mr. *Williamson*, when he was old. I mean the celebrated Mr. *Williamson* whom all the Ladies flock'd to see from all the corners of the Court, when he delivered his *Harangue* before Queen *Mary*; for he was a Captain of Horse in the *Rebelli-*

† Hist. of on at † *Bothwel bridge*. And I think any *Cadet* in *Dumbarton's* the *Consp.* *Regiment* may, without Vanity, be compared to a Captain of the *against K.* *Rebellion* at *Bothwell-bridge*.

Ch. II pag. 118.

And now that I mention Mr. *David Williamson*, I intreat him not to take it ill if I recommend the Censure of one part of your Preface to the Parliament, to himself; for amongst many other things with which you asperse the *Clergy of Scotland* that sojourn in Continuat. *England*, this is one, that *they troop about the Country with their Pref. p. 10. stoln Sermons*. Truly Mr. *Ridpath*, I do not know any one of them that preaches, except such as are provided with some Benefice in the Country, and I think that is no small part of their Disaster and Infelicity, so you cannot tell whether their Sermons are stoln or not. In some cases it is not only allowable to borrow but expedient, and if your Curiosity would engage you to read *St. Cyprian de Idolorum vanitate*, you would find that he hath several Sentences, nay the very turnings of *Phrases* from *Minutius Fælix*; and this argues his Love to the Author and to the thing rather than any Indigence of his own. If the *Curates* read good and solid Books and preach them to the People, why may not they be allowed to bring out of their *Treasure things new and old*. If the sparkish *Daw* in the Fable had only filled up the vacant places of her Wings with Feathers of her own kind, she had never been ridiculous; for we all of us acknowledge heartily that we borrow; but still it is from Birds of our own colour.

But Mr. *Ridpath*, I am to give an instance of an impudent Plagiary, who lately before the *Presbyterian Parliament*, in a Sermon designed to abuse the whole Order of *Bishops*, borrows from

Next comes your Compliment to the Memory of my Lord Dumbarton, as an Evidence of your extraordinary Prudence and Caution. You knew, that when your Book appeared my Lord Duke *Hamilton* was *Commissioner* to the *Parliament*, and then you expected the thorough Settlement of Presbytery, which now you have in *Folio*, by the late *Act*; and therefore it was not safe to reflect upon my Lord *Dumbarton* or his *Regiment*. But good Mr. *Ridpath*, speak out plainly, do you truly think that Persons of my Lord Duke *Hamilton's* Quality and Sence read such Pamphlets as yours; certainly you cannot be so mad, your Books are calculated for a lower order of Men, and tho you sent some of them beyond Seas, yet they are only considered by such who never read any thing but nasty Pamphlets, and who now and then dream of Plots, and reason about them with the same profound Sence that you do when you cite your *Logical Axioms*.

Now when you draw near to a Conclusion, you give the Dr. such a Blow, that he is not able to recover: for the Author of the Postscript said, that you began your Title page with a Lie, that your Book might be all of a piece. And this again provokes your

Heroick Passion, and you load your Antagonist with some of the most odious Reproaches that your Dictionary could furnish you with. But, Mr. Ridpath, what was it that he said ? why, he said that your Book was not printed for Tho. Anderson near Charing-Cross, and you charge him upon credit, to prove that it was not printed for him: And must you never be cured of this impertinence, that you oblige your Adversary to prove a *Negative* in a matter of Fact ? and then to make your ignorance the more conspicuous, you guard your desire with a *Logical Axiom, Affirmanti incumbit probatio.* I am ashamed of you, that you do not know the difference between an *Affirmative* and a *Negative Proposition*; when he said that it was not printed for Tho. Anderson near Charing-Cross, he affirmed nothing; and if he called you a Lyar, though such a Proposition sounded like an *Affirmative*, yet it was no *Affirmative Proposition*, but finally resolved into a *Negative*, and can no otherwise be proved than as a *Negative* may; and since he could meet with no Bookseller near Charing-Cross, who knew any such man of their Trade, might not he reasonably presume that your *Title-page* had a Lye in the bosom of it; notwithstanding all this it may be true that your Book was printed for him; and that he lives in some dark Vault near Charing-Cross. Such a thing is possible, though it be not very probable that a Bookseller should hide himself under-ground; for that is not their ordinary way of selling Books. I insist on this only to chastise your ignorance, and vanity, when you darken the whole Hemisphere with Dust, out comes your *Affirmanti incumbit probatio*, as if your Adversary had the *Affirmative* that ought to be proved.

You are so foolishly vain, that if all the particular Paragraphs of your first Book have not been considered, you conclude that your Adversary was convinced of their truth and solidity. The Error that I just now named brings to my mind another piece of fulsome ignorance of the same nature with the former. You may meet with it in the place cited on the Margin. Your Antagonist loaded the *Presbyterians* with inconsistencies, and particularly he exposed your dotage and fooleries concerning anniversary Days, and he might do it with the greater safety, because you still retain something in your practice which overthrows your Principles: for you celebrate the great Charities of *George Heriot* by an Anniversary commemoration :

tion : *Ergo* (says he) you are not against anniversary Solemnities. But you confute this argument very learnedly, and you prove from clear Scripture that *Anniversaries are unlawful*, because the fourth Commandment says positively, *Six days shalt thou work*: *Ergo*, you conclude, that all *Anniversary Solemnities* are unlawful. Now Mr. Ridpath, let us calmly consider the strength of your argument. All men are obliged by this Precept in the sense that you put upon it, or they are not ; if all are obliged (as no doubt they are) by what dispensation are they of *Heriot's foundation* exempted ? and if particular Societies be exempted, why may not the whole Nation pretend an exemption ? for one Society is no more privileg'd than another, and if all Societies may equally pretend an exemption, why may it not be granted to the whole Kingdom, which is but the political *aggregate* of so many Societies ? For, if they of *Heriot's Hospital* may celebrate an *Anniversary*, why may not all the Inhabitants of *Edinburgh* do it ? But you fortify your Opinion by a *Logical Axiom*, *Ex particulari non licet Syllogisare*, which you think signifies, that we must not draw precedents from the allowable practice of particular Societies ; and this is the Philosophy that you make such a noise with, whereas every Boy in the second *Class* that does not deserve whipping, can tell you that the meaning of that *Logical Rule* is, that *either of the premisses at least must be an universal Proposition*, whether *affirmative or negative* : for two particular propositions cannot bear the weight of a conclusion, no more than two *Negatives*. Now tell me sincerely, whether the making such a noise with *Logical Rules*, when you do not understand what they mean be not *Nonsense* and *pedantry*, in all their pomps and formalities. If the practice of *Heriot's Hospital* were to be defended by argument, the patrons of it would reason from the religious practice of all other Societies, the rules of gratitude, and the constitutions of the place, and a conclusion regularly deduced from such principles is not I hope *ex particulari*, as you ignorantly fancy. But not to trifle with you any more, the answer to your argument is contain'd in that short, but undeniable *Axiom* received by all Divines, *Præcepta affirmativa obligant semper, sed non ad semper* ; and we may work *six days, nisi interveniat feriacionis causa legitima, auctoritate divinâ vel humanâ stabilita*. Pray Mr. Ridpath, forgive all this *Latine* ; for I do not think that the speaking of *Latine* is at all times *pedantry*, and many are apt to let that

that pass for pedantick which they do not understand ; but if the phrase, *of your infectious Breath*, be the Word that provoked the Severity of your Centure, the Dr. in all Humility retracts it ; for tho your Breath be putrid, yet the Contagion spreads no further than People of your own Complexion, Men sufficiently infected before you breath'd upon them.

Mr. Ridpath, I do not pretend that this Treatise is methodical, and therefore I take no other Care to methodize my Animadversions on your Book, than as they tumble into my Fancy, I lie open to the censure of your *Histeron-Proteron* as oft as you please. Your Dédication to the *Scotcb Parliament* is as considerable as the Book it self, for being the only Book that was dedicated to them, it contains your own grave and serious Advice how to manage the publick Affairs. Next you fall upon the *poor Dr.* and he must be lash'd and chafis'd for his Rashnes and Precipitancy, because he presumed to give such an account of your first Book : but since you paint him as an *Ass* at the very beginning, why was you at so much pains with him ? so mean a Creature was below a Man of your Elevation ; and since you can defame and expose *Crowned Heads, Dukes, Earls, and Prelates*, why all this Noise to run down a poor *Hermite*. Your very first Blow hath in it so much Life and Wit, that one of his cold and phlegmatick Temper can never reach it, *As Postscript in Answer to the First.*

In the second Page of your *Continuation* there is a Catalogue of the most tragical Stories, made up to justifie all the Bitternes and Buffoonry of your former Pamphlet. You justifie the Severity of your Stile by the Answer of a *Tinker*. And truly if all the Parts of your Book had been equally pertinent, it had been the best *Presbyterian Farce* that appeared since its late Erection : but because I would let you understand that our Registers of Fanatick Cruelties, Rebellions and Perjuries are as exact as the Legends of your imaginary Grievances, I will set down eight Particulars in an opposite *Column* to your eight, and then we have sixteen.

Ridpath.

I. While the Memory of King Charles II. and King James VII. endures, and till Time, the Consumer of all things hath eat up their Parliament Rolls, it will hold an undeniable Truth, that the Prelatical Party of Scotland are Persecutors, and that in denying the same they have made themselves notorious Liars.

Ridpath.

II. So long as it appears by the same Acts, that they imposed a contradictory Test, so long will it hold that they are perjured themselves, and chargeable with the Perjury of others.

I. As long as we remember the Tumultuous Meetings, Rebellious Protestations, and the bloody Consequences of the Presbyterian Covenants and Associations, the Murder of our King, whom they tied Neck and Heels, until their Confederates brought him to the Scaffold, the Miseries of an intestine War, the Taxes, Contributions and Free-quarter imposed by the Arbitrary Power of rebellious Subjects and mock Parliaments, the Multitude of Errors, Heresies and Dreams, that were proclaim'd from our Pulpits, so long we remember that their Principles were inconsistent with the Royal Prerogative, our antient Constitution, as well as the Primitive Order of the Christian Church.

II. As long as we remember that the first Covenanters had all sworn the Oaths of Canonical Obedience to their respective Bishops in their several Dioceses, and that they dispensed with the said Oath of Canonical Obedience in their General Assembly (An. 1638. Sess. 13. Dec. 5.) and forgot their Allegiance to their natural Lord and Sovereign, and imposed their Babel Covenant on all in the most tyrannical manner,

and

and that to this day they continue to declaim against the legal securities of our Religion and Constitution as contradictory to it self; so long we must be excused to say that Presbyterians have no rule of Faith, but the Covenant, nor no Standard of Morals but the Practices of their rebellious Predecessors.

III. So long as we can remember that the Western Bigots and Incendiaries blew up the People into such mad Fancies, that they laid the whole stress of their Salvation upon their Zeal to promote the Covenant, and taught them to resist their lawful Sovereign, and to proclaim War against him, and printed Books to justify the most barbarous Assassinations; so long we may conclude that the People who are led by such Guides are in a most miserable Condition; and as long as we retain the exercise of Reason, and the sense of Self-preservation, so long our Governours must be commended, who guarded against the Dangers that threatned us under their Administrations; and so long as Men love their Peace, Constitution and Comfort, so long they must endeavour by the supereminent Law and first Principle

Ridpath.

III. *So long as it remains in the Records of Council, that they ordered Men to be killed without any Tryal or colour of Law, or so much as with an Exception, whether they resisted or not resisted, so long will it hold that they are bloody Murderers.*

eiple

ciple of all Societies, to teach Sanguinary Rebels to feel the Effects of their open Villanies and Conspiracies.

IV. As long as there are any Records of that Mock-Assembly preserved, the World may be easily satisfied, by their Impudent Queries and Disobedience to the King's Order, of their Tyranny and Ambition, and their Lording it over others, who, by their Confession are their Equals in Power and Jurisdiction, and that by divine right, and yet they suspend the Exercise of that Power which is conferred by divine Right, by virtue of an Act of Parliament, which I hope they do not think to be of any thing more than Human Authority.

V. As long as such blasphemous Nonsense as the *Decretum prædamnatum*, and the *Decretum præteritum*, are to be seen and read in the Writings of their greatest Champions; so long they are justly charged with Nonsense and Blasphemy. *Vid. Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland*. pag. 66.

Ridpath.

IV. *So long as the Records of the last General Assembly of the Church of Scotland remain, it will appear by their Evasions, Answers, and disingenuous refusals to declare their Abhorrence of Arminianism, Socinianism, and Popery, that they are Firebrands in the Church, and Incendiaries in the State.*

Ridpath.

V. *So long as any of their villainous Libels, called the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, exist, wherein they charge Holiness with Deformity, God with horrid Decrees, and mock at Seriousness and Piety; so long will it be evident that they are Blasphemers.*

H

VI. The

Ridpath.

VI. The Address of the Bishops of Scotland, before the Revolution, to the King, contained nothing but what was agreeable to the publick Prayers used in behalf of the King in both Nations; and Mr. Ridpath knows that the other Branch of this Particular must not be touched; yet as long as the Act of the West Kirk, and the Remonfrance in the Year 1650, (not to name preceding Papers of the same Nature, and Acts of the General Assembly in the year 1648) are preserved; so long the Presbyterian Principles are known to be subversive of all *Kingly Power*, and destructive to all Allegiance, and the Rights of Sovereignty.

VII. So long as the Acts of your Rebellious Parliaments from 1639 to 1649, and the Acts of your Assemblies in 1648 and 1649 continue upon record, and your zealous* Preachers importuning the Committee of Estates in person, to execute the King's most faithful Servants, so long the World may be informed of Presbyterian Spite and Malice.

*Guth.
MSS.

VI. So long as that scurrilome Address of their Bishops against the Prince of Orange, their opposing him in Parliament, their refusing to pray for him, or swear to him now he is King, and the legal procedure against them on the said accounts are on record; so long it will appear that they are Rebels.

Ridpath.

VII. So long as their bloody Acts of Parliament, and barbarous Execution of those Acts against us, and our gentle Acts of Parliament, and moderate Execution of those Acts against them, are upon record, so long it will appear that they are infamous Liars in asserting that we treat them more barbarously than they treated us.

VIII. As

Ridpath.

VIII. As long as the West of Scotland continues unrefor-med from barbarous Principles, so long they are a Plague to the Nation, and a Reproach to the Protestant Religion. This is only understood of such of them as deserve this Character.

VIII. *So long as the West of Scotland (which was the principal Scene of these bloody Tragedies) has a being, so long will it appear that they were barbarous.*

Before I take leave of you, I must put the Reader in mind of one Argument by which you endeavour to sully the Reputation of such of the Bishops as voted in the late Convention, before the King's Letter to them was opened, that *They were a free and lawful Meeting, notwithstanding of any Order that might be contained in that Letter to dissolve them*; from this you conclude, that they were inconsistent with their own Principles and after Practices. And the truth is, if they intended by that Vote nothing less than what the Presbyterian Party advanced; *they were inconsistent with their Principles*; but tho' they concurred in that Vote, they took the Words *a free and lawful meeting*, not to signify any Meeting of the People contrary to the King's Prerogative, Authority, and Standing Laws; but rather a Meeting to support all the three, and they were to sit notwithstanding of a Prohibition, until such time as they could duly inform the King of the Straits and Difficulties that they were involved in: Necessity made them bow under the Weight of that Opposition that they wrestled with; and they hoped that a Vote might be forgiven, which their Practices would have vindicated from any suspicion of lessening the Royal Authority. But Mr. Ridpath, did you never hear of a Merchant throwing overboard his Goods in a Storm, his Principle is (no doubt) to preserve, and improve his Stock, yet when Life, and Ship, and all is an hazard, Silver and Gold, and the best Cargo that he is Master of, must be flung over. Men sometimes, in the Simplicity of their Hearts, may yield to some publick Acts in a time of Danger and Confusion, which, in their own Nature and Tendency are inconsistent with their Principles: the wilest Men may sometimes mistake their mea-sures, and the prelacie of ones Mind does not perpetually attend

him. A great many of the *Presbyterians* of *Scotland* took the *Covenant* as it was enjoin'd by King *Charles I.* in the sence intended by King and *Parliament*, in the Reign of King *James VI.* yet this act of their duty and obedience was by the *Leading-Covenanters* thought inconsistent with their principles and practices, and therefore they were forced to disown it afterwards, and to adhere to the *Covenant* in its true and genuine sence of *Sedition* and *Rebellion*. All the *Presbyterians* of *Scotland* after the Restoration of King *Charles II.* both Ministers and People came to Church without scruple or hesitation, yet afterwards they began to think that this practice could not be reconciled to their mutinous Associations and *Covenants*; and therefore for the most part all of them left the Church and publick Worship of the *Episcopalian*s. There is a *Protestation* upon record in the Year 1641. in the journal of the *House of Commons*, May 3. which in its nature was but a *Prologue* to the *Solemn League and Covenant*, and very derogatory to the *King's prerogative*, and the ancient settlement of the Nation; and yet I find that several of the *Loyal Nobility*, and *six Bishops*, signed this *Protestation*.

Vid. Nals. bility, and six Bishops, signed this Protestation. Things may appear very plausible in the beginning, that are introductory to the saddest consequences. The *Nobility* and *Bishops* that signed the *Protestation* that I just now named, had reason to repent of their precipitancy, when the *Faction* owned above board, that no Reformation woul satisfie but the extirpation of *Root and Branch*, according to the phrase that then was in vogue. We are to take an estimate of mens principles, not from their indeliberate and casual stumblings in time of darkness, uncertainty and danger; but rather from their constant *Doctrine*, their habitual *Byass*, their more calm and sedate reasonings, their Books, *Homilies*, and *Sermons*. I could name later instances than any that I have touched, which might reasonably be presum'd to be inconsistent with their *Principles* who were *actors*, and yet I am so far from thinking them *disingenuous*, or *treacherous*, that I know them to be men of the greatest *Candor* upon Earth. All this I have said upon the supposition that the *Bishops* who concurred with that *Vote* of the *Convention* intended it in its full extent and latitude; but I know that they intended no more by the words, *free and lawful meeting*, than what they are capable of in the lowest sence that they can be taken in, and as *Privy Councillours* some of the *Bishops*, might suspend the execution of the *King's Orders* contained

Coll. 1 Vol.
from pag. 811, to 817.

tained in *his* Letters, until he should be better informed of the state of affairs, and until he should reiterate *his* Commands: in that case I am apt to think that all who own *his* authority would leave the Convention.

Mr. *Ridpath*, I would gladly know whether you think that a Libel against Dr. *Monro* was a Book worthy to be dedicated to the Parliament of *Scotland*? and whether your returning to *Scotland* was such an extraordinary advantage to the Nation, that you thought they would upon this consideration go forward to the thorough settlement of Presbytery? for no doubt you are among the first of those Students who promise to return, if your Model be established in its height. The Books that you have written against our *Kings*, *Dukes*, and *Parliaments*, may make atonement for the former Gallantries of your Life. I despise the knowledge of your particular History, and unless you are as stupid as you are petulant, you may guess by some dark hints in this Letter, (which I took care that no other should understand, but your self) that I am not altogether a stranger to your Adventures. I had your Life sent me, written by one of your Acquaintances, but though I may have many faults, yet I never loved personal Reproaches and altercations. When you are in the heighth of your humour and passion, I think you still below Revenge: It may be that the *Lay Gentleman* who is next to take you to task, may handle you more briskly; notwithstanding that Presbytery is now triumphant, and settled by an Act of Exclusion of the Episcopal Clergy: Mr. *Ridpath*, I sincerely wish you more sense and modesty, and I enter my Protestation before all reasonable men, that I am not obliged to answer indefinite Libels. If you think that you are so extraordinarily qualified to manage the Debates that are on foot: chuse one of the Questions that are toss'd between both the parties, either the divine Right of Presbytery, or the unlawfulness of *Anniversary* Days, or significant Ceremonies in the worship of God: I name these, because you offer to vindicate your own Opinions concerning them in your Books; and since you cite the *Epistles* of *S. Augustine* to *S. Jerome*, from which you say, the antiquity of Presbytery may be demonstrated, pray do not forget to name that Epistle; but I am affraid you will be forced to go to the Booksellers in *the World of the Moon*, before you can meet with it; and to make you amends, I offer to prove positively that there

is

is not one of your party in *Scotland*, that truly and sincerely represents the Opinions of St. *Jerom*: nay more expressly I offer to make evident from the writings of St. *Jerome*, that *Episcopacy* was established by the *Apostles*, and that he never dream'd of any such period of the Church wherein the parity of *Presbyters* prevailed after the death of the *Apostles*. And if you must write Books, you ought to come out from behind the *Cuttairis*, and let us know where your Bookseller may be found, and by whom they are Licensed, and take the assistance of all your Fraternity, read all the Books that you think defend your Cause to the best advantage, and let us plainly hear what grounds you have to assert, that your new and upstart Discipline is founded upon *divine Right*; and why the Ministers of the *Episcopal* persuasion are turned out, if they do not solemnly promise

* Vid. *Act of Parl.* for settling the peace of the Church, *Edinburgh*, June 12. 1693. *mise never directly nor indirectly* * to alter an Ecclesiastical Government, which can no more be reconciled to the former constitution of *Presbytery*, than to the

Word of God, the Canons of the Universal Church, and the practice of the first Ages of Christianity. And let us know if ever Clergymen were turned out of their Livings upon their denying to make any such promise, since the name of *Christian* was heard in the World: and do not run up and down, and make a noise as if I opposed an *Act of Parliament*, I only dispute against the Opinions of blind Zealots, who have no more regard to the peace of the Nation, than they have to the Order of *Episcopacy*.

Mr. *Ridpath*, If you are as resolute as you are clamorotis, you cannot but think it reasonable to appear, for no man is obliged to consider fulsome *Lampoons*, no accusations ought to be heard against any man (far less against *Kings*, *Dukes*, and *Prelates*) unless the accuser openly pawn his reputation to prove the Crimes fairly before a competent *Judicature*. There are many things in both your Books that I have not mentioned, yet I am ready to prove that they are less material and more ridiculous than those I have named; for I know no man so pusillanimous as to turn his back upon you for fear of any harm that you can do him, and therefore I set down the initial Letters of name and surname, and that in Mr. *Rule's Latine*, makes up *Totum Nomen*: and there are a great many here who know me, though at present I neither wear the Doctoral Scarf or Canonical Habit. I have hitherto treated you with all Civility, though there be none alive has fewer Engagements or Obligations to continue,

Mr. *Ridpath*,
Your humble Servant.

S. W.

POSTSCRIPT.

Mr. Ridpath,

THE following Certificates and Letter came to my hands from Scotland, not until the former Sheets were wrought off, else they had been set down in their proper places, to which they are more immediately related. The first is under the Hands of so many honest Inhabitants of Leith, in favours of Mr. Andrew Cant sometime their Minister; and it fully and plainly disproves and overthrows the Original and Fundamental Libel propagated by your self, and your Informers, against him, viz. That he was suspended from the exercise of his Ministry: and therefore the other Fabulous accounts, that you raise upon this Calumny, must necessarily fall to the Ground. It is not possible to prove Negatives in a Matter of Fact otherwise, than when they who ought to know the thing in Controversie, declare upon Honor and Conscience, that there never was any such things; and if the Course of his Ministry had been interrupted by any Sentence, how easily might this be prov'd; nay how impossible had it been to have deny'd it, since in so numerous a Parish, so near the Centre of the Nation, their would have been so many Witnesses of so recent a Transaction.

[Skipper]

[Skipper]

[Skipper]

[Skipper]

[Skipper]

[Skipper]

[Skipper]

We

We whose Names are underwritten, (Inhabitants of Leith)
 do by these presents declare upon Honor and Conscience,
 that Mr. Andrew Cant, (sometime our Minister) was
 never discharged the Exercise of his Office (by any Sen-
 tence, Ecclesiastical or otherwise) amongst us, but on the
 contrair, continued very diligent and painful therein,
 for the space of eight years or thereby, after which time
 he was preferred to be one of the chief Ministers of the
 City of Edinburgh.

Sic Subscriptur.

Jo. Broune,	[Skipper.]
Ja. Hutcheson,	[Notar Publick.]
John Burton,	[Baker.]
Alex. Robertson,	[Wine-Cooper.]
James Cunningham.	[Wine-Cooper.]
Patrick Smith,	[Wine-Cooper.]
John Wilson,	[Wine-Cooper.]
Thomas Riddell,	[Skipper.]
Ja. Balfour,	[Merchant.]
T. Fenwick,	[Maltman.]
Jo. Muchmutie,	[Skipper.]

James

James Johnston, [Wright (or Joyner.)

Rob. Herdman, [Maltman.

Robert Bowy, [Wine Cooper.

G. Farquhar, [Maltman.

Andrew Fairservice, [Carter.

Geo. Davidson, [Maltman.

George Albercromby, [Maltman.

J. D. [James Dow, Tailor.

J. W. [James Walker (as I took it) Mason.

The two last could subscribe no otherwise being illiterate but very Honest.

I have subjoyn'd to this Certificate a Letter to one of his Friends in *London*, occasion'd by your fulsome and unchristian Libels against him.

Worthy Sir,

Ever since I came to mans years, I have been very sensible that we live here in the Neighbourhood of a Sullen sett of People, that can never think themselves secure of any measure of Reputation, unless they raise it upon the Ruins of the good Name of innocent Men that are not of their Opinion in every thing, and am farther confirmed in this Thought by a late instance in what concerns me personally, in a slanderous Pamphlet in

I scribed,

scribed, *An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence*, It
 was some months in this place before I could procure a
 sight of it; but when I had seen it, the thoughts I had
 concerning what I am wickedly Libelled of, were not so
 full of Anger as Disdain, to find an obscure sorry Jack-
 anapes (for so he must be) attacquing me with so much
 Malice and arrant Calumny, though I was living very
 peaceably as I haye always done without being the Ag-
 gressor of any Person or Party. At first I was resolved to
 slight it, as a thing that can never do me harm with any one
 that knows me; yet upon ~~second~~ thoughts, and to satisfie a worthy Friend of mine, I give you the trouble of
 this line, which bears such short answers to the ill-natur'd
 and cursed accusations of that infamous Libeller, as I think
 sufficient.

First, Then he endeavours to vilifie and belie me, by
 saying I was an *Underling at Leith*. What he means by
 this I know not, the true matter is, that the first appear-
 ance I made in my *Sacred Office* was as second Mini-
 ster of *Leith*, to which I came regularly by a Presentati-
 on from the Patrons, and Collation thereupon from the
 Diocesan, I cannot apprehend any disparagement in the
 thing, and I am sure I have yet a very great kindness
 from all that People, excepting a few Bigots, and of very
 little interest. Next I remember he will needs have the
 World believe, that I Preached very odd things to the
 People, but has not so much as given one instance, not
 for want of Malice, but (it seems) invention, in that par-
 ticular. My poor gift of Preaching the Holy Gospel
 was but small, yet I bleſs God I am not ashamed of it, and
 I hope I have somthing of the power of those Divine
 Truths I declar'd to the World on my own Heart, and
 Seals of them upon the Hearts of others, but if this Railing
 Fellow doubt I be competently qualified, let him procure
 me Liberty and Safety I will not decline to Preach before
 the General Assembly.

In

'In another passage of that Pamphlet, this Silly Fellow
 'charges me with being a notable *Brawler*, and for proof
 'says, I was Suspended for sometime from the Exercise of
 'my *Office* for beating of a *Highlander*. To let you see
 'what Impudence is in this Contrivance, I send you here
 'with inclosed a Copy of a Declaration, under the Hands
 'of some of the honest Neighbours in *Leith*, bearing, that
 'I was never Suspended the Exercise of my *Office* during my
 'abode with them, and if it were necessary, I doubt not but
 'I can easily obtain the attestation of all that are yet alive
 'of them I left in the place. Its hard that I should be
 'obliged after fifteen years time to give them the trouble of
 'attesting my innocence against the snarlings of a rank-
 'mouth'd *Curr*: but I have done it very easily. Now this
 'being made appear a manifest lye, with a witness, there is
 'no place left to suppose I made use of any method for
 'returning to my *Office* which I never left, far less such im-
 'pious and silly ones, as he says, and would have believed
 'I did, and are not worth the mentioning, being such as I
 'fancy no man on Earth, (though of less heighth of Natural
 'Temper than I, and almost of equal Villany with the scurri-
 'lous Author) could be guilty of; but was it not a Lucky
 'thing that this mettled Spark charged me not with the Cri-
 'minous-Sins of Bestiality, Incest and Sorceries? Certainly
 'he had not failed of it, if they had not been Vertues pecu-
 'liar to the Saintship of one of his Friends, who was pub-
 'lickly burnt betwixt *Edinburgh* and *Leith*, upon confes-
 'sion of the foresaid Crimes, in my sight and some thousands
 'besides.

'In some other part, he charges me with Robbing of a
 'thousand Marks *Scots* mony, from *William Carfrey* who
 'came to pay me my Stipend due by the Town of *Edin-
 'burgh*. I shall never think it worth my Pains to offer a
 'Justification of my self from so ridiculous a Story; the
 'young man lives still in the City, and is so Just and

' Honest to declare to some of my acquaintance that it is a
 ' most notorious Lye; but Innocence it self cannot be secure
 ' against hellish Impudence. There is one thing more in his
 ' Paper, (not worth the minding indeed) which I had almost
 ' forgot, *viz.* That I was, at the time of his Writing, a Va-
 ' gabond at London; if a Man must be branded with this
 ' Character for going from one place to another, he has
 ' been much longer a Vagabond than I, as I am told, and I
 ' am sure for his bloody uncharitableness, deserves the mark
 ' of a second *Cain*, and the Character of another *Accuser of*
 ' the Brethren, having been made very skilful in the Art of
 ' Lying, by his Father, who has used it since the beginning.
 ' I leave this Letter intirely to your disposal: I ask your
 ' pardon for this trouble, and am with all respect,

Sir,
Edinburgh,
July 29. 1693. Your affectionate faithful,

humble Servant,

Andrew Cant.

THE next Certificate is in favours of Dr. Alexander
 Monro, and it serves the end for which it is publish'd.
 You say that when he was in Scotland, he was so and so
 accus'd as is narrated in the following Certificate. If this
 had been true, there is no doubt to be made but that Per-
 sons of Honour, Sense, and Interest, in the Cities of Edin-
 burgh and St. Andrews would have heard of it, especially
 since he was preferr'd to such places as would provoke
 Rivals and Competitors. And is it to be believ'd, that
 the least surmise of that Nature could have escaped the In-
 dustry

dustry of the *Presbyterians*, who scrupled not to pretend to the knowledge of his very Thoughts without any external Evidence? I have often told you that *Negatives* in a Matter of Fact are not otherwise to be prov'd? 'Tis no wonder that so malicious an Accuser should mistake Truth for Falshood, and Falshood for Truth, when you have not yet attain'd to so much Sense, as to distinguish between an *Affirmative* and a *Negative* Proposition. You are firmly resolv'd to defame and disparage the Episcopal Clergy at any rate, and that hath occasion'd the following Evidence of your Candor and Veracity.

Whereas Dr. Alexander Monro (late Principal of Edinburgh College) is said in an impertinent Libel, Entituled, A Continuation of the Answer to the Scotch-Presbyterian Eloquence, to have been accused when he was in Scotland of being found with a Woman among the Corn, We whose names are under written, (living in and near to the City of Edinburgh) do by these presents declare upon Honor and Conscience that we never heard that he was so accused, and that if any such Accusation had ever been invented against him, We think it very probable that we would have heard of it, especially since so narrow an inquisition has been made into his Life and Actions in the beginning of the Late Revolution, when for Non-Compliance he was turned out of the College of Edinburgh,

Sic Subscrbitur.

W. Binning. { Sir William Binning of Wallinford,
 late Lord Provost of Edinburgh.

J. Dick. { Sir James Dick of Priest-field, late
 Lord Provost of Edinburgh.

Tho.

Tho. Kennedy, { Sir Thomas Kennedie of Kirk-Hill,
 late Lord Provost of Edinburgh.

John Marjoribanks, [Late Bailiff of Edinburgh.

Ja. Henryson, [Writer to the Signet there.

John Baillie, [Apothecary and Chirurgeon there.

Robert Clerk, [Apothecary and Chirurgeon there.

A. Skene, { Alexander Skene, D. D. Late Pro-
 vost of the old College in the
 University of St. Andrews.

Ri. Waddell, { Richard Waddell, D. D. Late Arch-
 Deacon of St. Andrews.

A. Macleod, [Mr. Alexander Macleod, Advocate.

James Flemyeng, { Sir James Flemyeng of Ratho-byres,
 late Lord Provost of Edinburgh.

A. Balfour, { Sir Andrew Balfour, Doctor of Me-
 dicine.

Ar. Stevenson, { Sir Archibald Stevenson, Doctor of
 Medicine.

Will. Monipenny, [Mr. William Monipenny, Advocate.

T. Skene, [Mr. Thomas Skene, Advocate.

C. Gray, [Mr. Charles Gray, Advocate.

Al. Craufurd,

Al. Craufurd,	[Mr. Alexander Craufurd, Advocate.
Jo. Mackenzie,	{ Mr. John Mackenzie, one of the Clerks of Session.
Du. Mackintosh,	[Late Bailiff in Edinburgh.
Æn. Macleod,	[Town-Clerk.
J. Wedderburn,	{ Mr. John Wedderburn, Clerk of the Bills.
Al. Gibson,	[One of the Clerks of the Session.

Mr. Ridpath,

I Would have gladly taken leave of you long before now, but that I am not left at liberty as to the following Letter. It is occasioned by your own Civilities to the Archbishop of Glasgow and others. We oppose the Publick Records of the Nation to your Clamorous and Obscene Libels; and if there were nothing else to prove the madness of your Temper than that one Story of Margaret Paterson, we need no other proof to convince the World of your desperate Impudence.

A Letter from a Gentleman in Scotland to his Friend
in London. Edinburgh, July 22. 1693.

Sir,

I Had not yours till last Night, which lets you see
that it hath been a month by the way, and this is
the true Reason your return is so late.

As to that silly Varlet *Ridpath*, all I can say of him
more than yours to me contains, which I know to be
most exact Truth, is, that being apprehended and made
Prisoner here about *Christmas 1680*, for contriving and
writing a Bond of Combination, or kind of Association,
for burning the *Pope in Effigie*, which you know was a
folly never before that time attempted here, and was de-
sign'd then by the Rogues of this City, particularly
the *Presbyterians*, as an indignity to his (then) Royal
Highness. This Bond being found in the custody of this
Villain, by the diligence of the Learned and Reverend
Dr. Cant (then) Principal of King *James* his University of
Edinburg, (who, though he was a Celebrated Champion
for the Protestant Church, yet had he a just indignation a-
gainst all Rabbling and Tumults.) This Bond, I say, is now
in the Council Office, and I have often seen and read it. 'Tis
indeed a young League and Covenant, containing a Clause
of Mutual Defence, not excepting the King, or any in Au-
thority under him; and an invitation to Prentices, and all
others to joyn in this their Association. Now a Bond of
this Nature is by many Laws and Acts of Parliament de-
clared Treason; and that, not only since the dreadful ef-
fects of the Infamous League and Covenant, but even
by

by very old Acts in the Reigns of King James the First, and Second, so much for this. This Scoundrel was committed, who was not then a Boy, but a Fellow come to Years, and then a Servant to two Sons of one Gray, a person living on the English Border, and of the same Gang with his Man *Ridpath*.

• The Fellow confess'd before the Committee of Council, that he had drawn this Bond, but would not own that he had been prompted to it, or assisted in it by others, though the Council well knew, that many of the Ringleaders of the Party were the promoters of this Trick, which was design'd as a Prologue to a Rebellion against the (then) Government. For this Villany the Law here might have justly sent him to the Gibbet, and perhapsthe Council had put him in the hands of the *Judges Criminal*, had he not, been preserv'd by the unparallel'd Clemency of the Prince that (then) sate at the Helm here, which you know is so natural to that Sacred Race. I remember the *Duke of Rothes* the *Chancellour*, and several other great Lords having examin'd him, and finding him very false and obstinate in his Answers, order'd him to be committed Close Prisoner till he were further examin'd. And as he was going to Prison, seeing a Crowd abut him, and considering them as a Rabble, he cry'd out aloud, that he was suffering for the *Protestant Religion*, the ordinary, but false pretence of all Seditions and Rebellions here. For which he was for some days put in Irons, and a little after by the Goodness of his (then) Royal *Highness*, who was always too compassionate to that *Generation of Vipers*, he was dismissed. This is all I can remember or learn of this Creature.

• I hear in his late Pamphlet, which I have not yet seen, he has the Impudence to say, that one *Margaret Paterson* (a Prostitute sufficiently infamous) should have confess'd somewhat before the *Criminal Court* relating to the

• Archbishop of *Glasgow* and me; I am satisfied that all that
 • that Villain has scrib'd of the Bishop be believed, if ever
 • she named either the Bishop or me in her Confessions, ei-
 • ther before that Court, or any Confessions else, whether
 • publick or private. Nor did the Bishop hear of such a
 • Creature, till the noise was made at her being taken na-
 • ked in the Bed with the late *Presbyterian Moderator Ken-*
 • *nedy* his two Sons, for which they stand declared Fu-
 • gitives in the *Justice Court Books*, for the horrid Crime
 • of Incest.

• As to what relates to the *C—ks*, I make you this di-
 • stinct Return. In the year 1684, Sir *Hugh* and Sir
 • *George Campbells* of *C—k*, with *Baylie* of *Jerviswood*,
 • *Commissar Monro*, Mr. *William Spence*, Mr. *William Car-*
 • *stairs*, and some others were sent down Prisoners here by
 • Sea, and were kept close for some Weeks; during which
 • time I had occasion to be often with them, for the Coun-
 • cil ordered any of their Friends to converse with them,
 • and see them, in presence of any of the Clerks of Coun-
 • cil; and such of them as are yet alive, and their Rela-
 • tions will bear me witness, that I was as easie to them
 • that way as they could desire. For, the truth is, they
 • all professed so much Innocence in the matter they were ac-
 • cused of, (which was for being in a Conspiracy with the
 • late *Monmouth* and *Argyle* for raising a Rebellion in both
 • Nations at the same time, and which fell out the next
 • year accordingly) and that with all the circumstantiated
 • Imprecations to them and their Families, that I began to
 • believe the Government had been imposed upon in this
 • matter, and contracted such a compassion for them, as
 • made some of our then *Statesmen* angry with me: and yet
 • *Carstairs* upon the first application of the Thumb-Screw,
 • even the first touch of it, confessed all, as may be seen in
 • his Printed Confession in the Tryal of *Jerviswood*; and
 • then *Monro*, and afterwards the two *C—ks* themselves;
 • which

which two *Campbells* were upon their Judicial Confession forefaulted in plain Parliament 1685, and their Estates annex'd to the Crown: tho the King gave them not only both Remissions for their Lives, but even ordered their Estates to be returned to them, upon their paying a very inconsiderable Composition to some of the then *Statesmen*. That which the Rascal *Ridpath* aims at, I suppose, is a Process which was commenced some time before that, against old *C—k*: the undisguised matter of Fact was, truly this, which you may rely upon for certain and recorded Truth.

There was one *Wallace* a Collector or Surveyor in *Airshire*. This Man gives Information to the Secret Committee, that there were three Men in that Country who had assured him that old *C—k* had encouraged several Country People to the Rebellion at *Both well Bridge*, 1679; and that particularly he had said to themselves whom he encountered with upon a place, called the *Bridge of Gaistoun*, near his own House, *What meant such young lusty Fellows to stay at home, when the People of God were in Arms for their Covenanted Cause*; and bid them go on to the rest (the Whig Army being then at *Hamilton*, within ten Miles or thereby to that place) for he and the rest of the Country would quickly be with them. Upon which Information the three Fellows are brought in, and kept some time in the *Cannon gate Prison*. I heard them examined before the Secret Committee, and all of them both jointly and separately were very positive, clear, and distinct in their Depositions. Upon this an Indictment is raised against *C—k*, and the same Witnesses are again examined upon Oath before the *Justices*, which is called by our Law a *Precognition*, and there they were again very firm, and seemed altogether clear and sincere. But the Day of the Tryal being come, and a disaffected Crowd getting in about these Witnesses, when they came to de-

' pone they began to waver much, and upon the matter de-
 ' ny much of what they had twice clearly made oath of
 ' before; so that the Jury brought in C——k not guilty;
 ' and so he was acquitted from that Indictment. And the
 ' next day the same three Rogues begged to be heard before
 ' the Council, where I heard them again upon their Knees,
 ' and with all the Solemnities of Truth and Sincerity, Pro-
 ' test and Swear, that what they had first Sworn was simple
 ' Truth, and that their Carriage the day before in the
 ' Court, was occasioned by their being terrified to swear
 ' against C——k, so great a Man in that Corner of the
 ' Country. But upon the whole Matter, the worthy Sir
 ' George Mackenzie had no more hand in all this Affair, but
 ' merely to pursue as the King's Advocate. And in general
 ' I can affirm, as in the sight of the God of Justice and Truth,
 ' I do believe, after all the Enquiry I have made, that ne-
 ' ver a person suffered in Scotland by Subornation or false
 ' Witnesses employed by the Government since the Restora-
 ' tion of the Royal Family. Tho many of the Rebels have
 ' been brought off, and assolzied by the scandalous and bare-
 ' faced Perjuries of their own Party: for in the Tryals of
 ' those Rebels, the Witnesses for the King being formerly
 ' engaged in the saids Rebellions, made use of such strange
 ' and uncouth Fetches and Strains of Words, that no Jury
 ' could fix any Vettict or Doom upon; for being interro-
 ' gated, if they saw the person at the Barr in Arms with
 ' the Rebels (as particularly in the case of one Sprewel, an
 ' eminent Ringleader and Captain, several of his own
 ' Kinsmen as well as Acquaintances, and who had ridden
 ' under his Command) they were brought with great diffi-
 ' culty to confess, that they thought they had seen a Man there
 ' which seemed to be somewhat like the Prisoner at the
 ' Bar, but for a World they could not swear, that this Pri-
 ' soner was the person they saw there. Being ask'd, if he
 ' had a Sword; they answered, they saw that person have

' something

Something like the end of a Scabbard, hanging from under his Cloak, but whether there were a Blade there or not they could not tell; and being question'd on oath all the while if that person had Pistols; they confessed they had seen something like *Hulster-Cases* at his Saddle, but whether there were Pistols in them or not, they could not swear for a *World*. And by such Presbyterian Canting Perjuries as these, this *Sprewel*, and many others were brought off.

Dear Sir,

I am afraid I have been too tedious in this Return, but since it contains nothing but simple Truth, it will be the welcomer to you, and therefore is subscribed by

Yours Humble and Faithful Servant, T. S.

W. P.

ADVERTISSEMENT.

THE Following Propositions are taken out of such Books as are most in Vogue amongst the Scotch Presbyterians. They contain a short Account of their Moral Theology with regard to Obedience, Subjection, and Government. I desire the impartial Reader to let me know, wherein the Sentiments of the Kirk differ from the Doctrines propagated by the Jesuits. You have many of them gathered together in one view, not at all as an Answer to any of Mr. Ridpath's Scribblings, but as a sufficient Confutation of the impertinent Clamours against the Government of King Charles the Second. For since they were taught by their Religion to rebel against their

their King and Parliament, our Governors could not but secure the Peace of the Nation against such barbarous Practices as were indeed the natural Consequences of their Principles.

A Man ought no more to suffer when the Sentence is unjust, than he ought to do that which is unjust and sinful at the command of Authority. *Jus. Pop.* throughout.

2. No Authority can command or can oblige until he himself that is commanded be convinced and persuaded that the thing is just, reasonable, and expedient. *Gillesp. Ingl. pop. Cerem.*

3. To oppose the persons invested with Authority, is not to oppose the Ordinance of God, for the Ordinance of God is Magistracy *in abstracto*, that is it that we are commanded *Rom. 13.* not to resist, but the person of the King ought to be resisted. *Lex. Rex* pag. 265. and when the Parliaments of both Kingdoms fought against the King's Person, they fought for his Royal Interest, and as he was a King, ~~and tho' the person of the King was absent~~, and denied his consent as a Man, yet they were as valid Parliaments as if he were personally present with them. *Lex. Rex* 270.

4. Patient Suffering fall under no Law of God. *Lex. Rex* pag. 314. *Vide Napht. pag. 157.*

5. The Presbytery hath the power of making peace and war, neither ought the Parliament enter into war without them no more than *Joshua* did offer battel without *Eleasar*, the High Priest. *Acts Gen. Ass. 48. Agust 3.*

6. Since

*De Jure
Regni pag.
46, 47.*

6. Since Religion is the highest Interest of Mankind, it is not only lawful but necessary for private Subjects to rise in Arms against the King to reform the Abuses crept into it, and when the supreme Powers serve not the great Ends of Religion, we are *ipso facto* loos'd from all Tyes of Obedience to them. *Naph. pag. 154. Vide Jus Populi throughout.*

7. The Presbytery may excommunicate the King, and when he is excommunicated, none of his Subjects owe him Obedience, neither may they converse with him. *Jesuits and Presbyterians.*

8. There is nothing to be allowed of in the Worship of God as to its Order and Circumstance that is not founded on the express Letter of the Scripture; the unscriptural symbolical Ceremonies are the Badge of Antichrist. *All the Sectarians.*

9. It is a good Argument against any part of the Worship of God to have it abolish'd, that it was or is still to be found in the Mass-Book. *Bailies Parallel of the Liturgy.*

10. It is lawful and necessary to enter into Covenants and Leagues without the King, and formally to protest against the King's most legal Methods to the contrary. *Prot. at the Cross Ed. 37. p. 38.*

11 The King having now for many years usurped the power of Christ, and most palpably tyrannized in Civil Matters, he is to be deposed and brought to punishment, and all the Covenanted People of the Lord are to fight against him and his Adherents, under the Standard of Christ Jesus. *Sanchor. Declar. 22, June 1680. and Cargill's Cov. brought out.*

12. It is downright Idolatry, and prejudicial to the Honour of Christ and the Interest of Reformation to appoint anniversary Days for Benefits bestowed on the King and Kingdom. *Apol. Narrat. Naph.* p. 87.

13. The minor part of a Kingdom that is for God and his Cause against the King, if they be in a probable capacity to bring their Design to pass, ought by the Call of God to endeavour the Reformation of their Nation by Force of Arms. *Naph. and Jus. Populi throughout.*

14. Tho our Saviour told his Disciples, *John 18. 36.* That his Kingdom was not of this World, and that they ought not to fight for him, yet it obliges not the Christians now, they may fight without and against the Consent of the supreme Magistrate. *Jus. Pop. Praef. to the Reader, and Naph.* pag. 159.

15. The greatest reproach that the People of God could be exposed to, was to own the King's Proceedings, without Satisfaction to the covenanted People of God in both Kingdoms. *Vide Act of the West-Kirk.*

16. None have right to the Creature but the People of God, or Dominion is founded in Grace. *Enthus. and Sect.*

17. The Scot's Covenant is the *Magna Charta* of all Religion and Righteousness, and not only obliges those who personally swore it, but the whole Nation to all succeeding Generations in all its Tendencies and natural Consequences. *Naph. pag. 83. and 185.*

18. The Success that the Presbyterians had in the late Troubles against the King and his Adherents, were undeniable Signs of God's Favour to that Party, and to follow and

and promoye their Succes, was to follow Providence.
Act. of Gen. Assm. frequently. And those who fought for the King fought against the Lord Jesus Christ. *Ibidem* <sup>Vide Se-
sonable Warning.</sup> *An. 45.*

19. It is the Duty of the meanest Subject in his most private capacity (nay, they are indispensably obliged to it) to admonish and reprove the King when they observe any thing that they think contrary or disadvantageous to the Presbyterian Interest and Reformation. *Naph.* pag. 86.

20. The covenanted People of God adhering to the faithful Ministers of Christ that owned the Cause and Covenant, and forsaking the Apostate Hirelings, the many Conversions wrought upon them were infallible Marks that God did approve them in their Proceedings against wicked Rulers. *Cup of Cold Water.*

21. The Change made in the Church of Scotland at the King's Return, from Presbytery to Episcopacy did naturally, and in its just Consequence and Tendency, overthrow the very Foundation of Religion, and the change is no less than from the pure Worship of God, to down right Idolatry. *Naph. Pref. to the Reader, pag. 4, and 5.* *Ibidem* 84.

22. Whoever is a sincere Seeker of God, and truly Regenerate, will immediatly discern upon his seeking of God, *ipso facto*, the profanity and wickedness of all that adhere to the Episcopal Church. *Naph. pag. 11.*

23. It was the peculiar Lot of the Church of Scotland, more eminently than any other Church upon Earth, to

contend against the Powers of this World, for the Scepter and Kingdom of Jesus Christ; by their Protestations, Petitions, Remonstrances, Declinators and all other Methods to advance Presbyterian Interest. *Naph. Pref. to the Reader, pag. 16.*

24. Papacy and Prelacy have one and the same Original, and their adherents are the Synagogue of Anti-christ. *Naph. Pref. to the Reader, pag. 20. and pag. 154. and pag. 184. and pag. 53.*

25. The People of God in these Nations ought to rest assur'd that their Enemies shall be ruin'd and destroy'd, for the Lord hath said that the false Prophets shall pass out of the Land, and all that Countehance them shall be ashamed, and ought we not to believe what God himself hath said. *Naph. Pref. and pag. 153.*

26. No Ecclesiastick is oblig'd to give the King or his Council an account of any Doctrine Preached by him immediately, and *Prima instantia*, he is oblig'd to the Presbyterian Classis; and if the King meddle with him, or call him to an account immediately, he invades the Scepter of Jesus Christ, and if he arrogate unto himself the power of Convocating National or Provincial Synods, he confounds the Government of Jesus Christ with the Civil, and invades his Authority; therefore it is not safe, nor Scriptural Dialect, to say the King is Supreme Goverour over all Persons, and in all Causes. *Naph. frequently, and page 38, and 40.*

The Royal Prerogative in cognoscing upon the Doctrine of Ministers, is the Devil's great design to endear the Powers on Earth to the Prelates. *Ibidem.*

27. The

27. The Presbytery can Counter Act the Acts and Statutes of the Supreme Court of Parliament, and can forbid all the Subjects to obey those Laws, if imposed without their Consent. *In July 28. Anno 1648. Act and Declaration against the Act of Parliament.*

28. No Man can enter lawfully to the Ministry, but by the Call of the People, but when the People are Malignant, then the Presbytery may give them a Minister. *Act. Gen. Assem. August 4. 1649.*

29. When the Presbytery appointed a Fast, upon King James his appointing of a Feast, they did nothing but what they were oblig'd. in Conscience to do. *Lex Rex Pref. to the Reader.*

30. If the King will not Reform Religion, the Assembly of godly Pastors and People ought to Reform it, and they may swear a covenant without the King; and if he refuse to build the Lords House, they may relieve and defend one another, when they are opprest and hinder'd in the Work and Cause of God. *Lex Rex Pref. to the Reader.*

31. Inferior Judges are no less essentially Judges and God's Vice-Gerents on Earth than the King himself. *Lex Rex, pag. 159. IT*

32. The King is under the Law as to its Coercive limitation, and ought to be resisted by force of Arms. *Lex Rex, pag. 231. Duglas Coron. Ser. pag. 22. and elsewhere frequently.*

33. The King is not the final and supreme Interpreter of the Law. *Lex Rex*, pag. 252.

34. The King's Prerogative Royal, and the Oath of Supremacy are directly contrary to the Word of God, and the Fundamental Laws of this Kingdom. *Naph.* pag. 86.

35. To allow that the present graceless Hirelings and Curates, had so much as an external Call to the Ministry, were as much as to make the God of Order, the Author of Confusion. *Naph.* pag. 104, 105.

And the true Zeal of God would inspire us to eradicate those Plants that our Heavenly Father never planted. *Ibidem* pag. 108.

And to bid the Covenanted People of God come to the Church, is the height of Oppression and Rigour. *Ibidem* pag. 109.

36. A King that transgresses the Law is degenerate into a Tyrant, and ought to be ranked amongst such as destroy the Peace and Advantages of Human Societies, because they transgress the limits and bounds of their Constitution, therefore are they hateful to God and men, and to be looked upon as no better than Wolves, Tigers, and Lions, and the death of such ought to be rewarded by the whole People, and every one of them. *De Jure Regni*, pag. 36.

37. The Oaths given by Intrants to their Bishops, at their Ordination, do not oblige at all, because they bind us to those Constitutions that were not allowed by the Presbytery. *Act. Gen. Assem. Decemb. 5. 1638.*

38. The

38. The call of a clear and necessary Providence is, enough for Christs Witnesses to resist and stand up against earthly Powers, and to this they are indispensably obliged, when they are in a probable capacity to act successfully, although the Motive of Self-defence were not conjoin'd; and all such Combinations for Just and Necessary ends, are warranted before God and men, notwithstanding of any pretended Law to the contrary: and to affirm that the first and last Covenanters were acted by a Spirit of Rebellion, is a sin the next degree to the sin against the Holy Ghost. *Naph. pag. 7, 8. 12. 16.*

39. The great Law of Self-Preservation, in its immediate and most natural Effects, teach us, and indispensably oblige us to resist Kings, and all Superior Powers when they command things contrary to the Word of God; nay when the great ends of Government are perverted, then the Bond thereof is dissolved, and the People thus liberated therefrom do relaps into their Primevē Liberty, and may upon the very same Principles Combine and Associate for their better defence, that they first enter'd upon unto Society. *Naph. pag. 147, 148. 150.*

40. When the faithful of the Land are destitute of the best and surest means to overthrow the present Government and wicked Governours, they are still oblig'd to use their utmost endeavours. *Naph. pag. 155.*

41. We ought not to believe that the Primitive Christians were so numerous as the first A pologists for Christianity did give out, they were deceived in a Matter of Fact, for the Sufferings of the Martyrs do not at all militate against the lawfulness of Defensive Arms. *Lex Rex, pag. 2. 71.*

42. The

42. The very power to Extirpate the present Government
is God's Call to do so. *Cargil's New Cov. Art. 1.*

43. We are no more bound by any tie of Allegiance to
the present Governours, than we are bound in Allegiance
to the Devils. *Cargil's New Cov. Art. 9.*

If the Scotch Presbyterians under the former Reigns had satisfied themselves with the Theory of Rebellion, and if they had not actually practis'd according to the full extent and tendency of their Principles; then their Writings and Seditionous Sermons might have been tolerated with the greater Ease: but since those active Gentlemen ventur'd upon the Natural Conclusions that their Principles yielded, so that none of the Kings Loyal Subjects knew but that they were to be murder'd as soon as they stept out of Doors. I hope modest Men will allow that severes Laws were very necessary when the Holy Scriptures were perverted to destroy the General Peace of Mankind; and fiery Enthusiasts were made believe, that they might make bold with the Life of any Man, whom they took to oppose their own Dreams, if they fancyed that their Neighbours were Canaanites and Moabites. Most of them that bawl'd against the Government of *Charles II.* are such as never understood the Temper of our Religious Incendiaries, or were themselves deeply ingaged in the Rebellion; and therefore I have added to the former Papers, the following Letter, to undeceive such as are misinform'd, and to let the World see that it was impossible for our Kings and Parliaments to forbear the making of such Laws as our Enemies complain of; when the Holy Scriptures were wrested contrary to their True Meaning, and made to truckle under the hellish designs of incorrigible Hypocrites. The following Paper is a very Authentick

thentick one, written by the famous Assassin Mr. James Mitchel, who attempted the Life of the Arch-Bishop of St. Andrews upon the Streets of Edinburgh, and in doing so, wounded the Bishop of Orkney. This Sacrilegious Effort he endeavours to justifie from the Holy Scriptures. The Presbyterians cannot take it ill that the Monuments of their Martyrs are preserv'd; if they say that all Presbyterians have not such Principles, I say so too: but then, they must remember, that such were the Presbyterians against whom the Laws were made under the former Reigns; and 'tis difficult to know whether all of them have not the same Principles, if once they are provok'd to anger, and if they are consequential to the Doctrine of the first Puritans: for * Goodman saith expresly, That, *If the Magistrates shall refuse to put Mass-mongers and false Preachers to death, the People in seeing it perform'd do shew that zeal of God which was commended in Phineas, destroying the Adulterers, and in the Israelites against the Benjamites.* Let any sober Man consider what Improvemnts the Principles of the following Letter are capable of; and then let him tell me, whether he can name any Crimes punished by any Magistrates in any Corner of the World, more dangerous to human Society, than the Doctrines that he may read with his own Eyes in this Letter. I have copied it from that Collection of Mr. Mitchel's Papers, which his own Confederates took great care to Print and preserve in the latter Editions of *Naphtali*.

* See dangerous Positions by Bishop Bancroft, p. 35.

THE
over I
own bus
participat
two
participat

T H E
C O P Y
OF A
L E T T E R
FROM

Edinburg Tolbooth, February 1674.

' **M**E who may justly call my self less than the least of all
 ' Saints, and the chiefest of all Sinners: yet Christ
 ' Jesus calleth to be a Witness for his despised Truth, and
 ' trampled on Interests and Cause, by the wicked, blasphemous and God contemning Generation, and against all their
 ' perfidious wickedness. *Sir*, I say, the Confidence I have in
 ' your real Friendship, and Love to Christ's Truth, People,
 ' Interest and Cause, hath encouraged me to write to you
 ' at this time, hoping you will not misconstrue me, nor
 ' take advantage of my Infirmity and weakness. You have
 ' heard of my Inditement, which I take up in these two
 particulars;

particulars; First, As they term it Rebellion and Treason, anent which I answered to *My Lord Chancellor* in Committee, that it was no Rebellion, but a Duty which every one was bound to have performed in joyning with that party, and I in the Year 1656, *Mr. R. L.* being then *Primar* in the *Colledge of Edinburg*, before our *Laureation*, tendered to us the *National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant*, upon mature Deliberation, I found nothing in them, but a short compend of the Moral Law, only binding us to our Duty, towards God and towards Men in their severall Stations, and I finding, that our banished King's Interest lay wholly included therein, and both Coronation and Allegiance Oaths, &c. and they being the Substance of all Loyalty, and my Lord, it was well known, that many were taking the Tender, and forswearing *Charles Stuart*, Parliament, and House of Lords, I then subscirbed both, the doing of which, *My Lord Chancellor* would have stood at no less rate, it as well known, than this my present adhering and prosecuting the Ends thereof doth now, and when I was questioned what then I called Rebellion, I answered, it is in *Ezra vii. Verse 26.* *And whosoever will not do the Law of God and of the King, &c.* but being questioned before the Commissioner and the Council therea nent, I answered, as I said to my *Lord Chancellor* before, in the Year 1656. *Mr. R. L.* being then *Primar* in the *Colledge of Edinburg*, before our *Laureation*, he tendered to us the *National and Solemn League and Covenant*: He Stopt me, Saying, I'll wad ye are come here to give a Testimony: And then being demanded what I called Rebellion, if it was not Rebellion to oppose his Majesties Forces in the Face:

' To the which I answered, *viz.* *My Lord Chancellour,*
 ' if it please your Grace, I humbly conceive they should
 ' have been with us, according to the National and So-
 ' lemn League and Covenant, at which Answer I per-
 ' ceived him to storm. But, saith he, I heard ye have
 ' been over Seas, with whom did ye converse there?
 ' Answer, with my Merchant: But, saith he, with
 ' whom in particular? Answer with one *John Mitchel* a
 ' Cousin of mine own. Saith he, I have heard of him,
 ' he is a Factor in *Rotterdam*, to which I conceded. But,
 ' saith he, did ye not converse with *Mr. Livingston*, and
 ' such as he, to which I answered, I conversed with all
 ' our banished Ministers. To which he replied, ba-
 ' nished Traitors, ye will speak Treason at the Bar,
 ' Then he answered himself, saying, But they would call
 ' the shooting at the Bishop an Heroick Act. To which
 ' I answered, that I never told them any such thing, but
 ' where did you see *James Wallace* last? Answer,
 ' Towards the Borders of Germany some years a-
 ' go. But what ailed you at *My Lord St. Andrews*?
 ' (pointing at him with his Finger.) Answer, *My Lord*
 ' Commissioner, the grievous Oppression, and horrid
 ' Bloodshed of my Brethren, and the eager pursuit after
 ' my own, as appeareth this day to your Grace, and to
 ' all his Majesties Honourable Privy Council. After
 ' which he commanded to take me away, that they
 ' might see what to do next with me.

' The Second is, the shooting of the Shot intended a-
 ' gainst the *Bishop of St. Andrews*, whereby the *Bishop of*
 ' *Orkney* was hurt, to which I answered *My Lord Chan-*
 ' *cellor* in private, *viz.* that I looked on him to be the
 ' main Instigator of all the Oppression and Bloodshed of
 ' my

my Brethren that followed thereupon, and the continual pursuing after my own, and, my Lord, as it was credibly reported to us (the Truth of which your Lordship knows better than we) that he kept up his Majesties Letter inhibiting any more Blood upon that Account, until the last Six was execute: And I being a Soldier, not having Laid down Arms, but being still upon my own Defence, and having no other End nor Quarrel at any Man (but according to my apprehension of him) that as I hope in Sincerity with fixing either my Sense or Action upon the Covenant it self, as it may be understood by the many thousands of the Faithful, besides the Prosecution of the Ends of the same Covenant, which was, and in that point the Overthrow of Prelates and Prelacy, and I being a declared Enemy to him on that account, and he to me in like manner. So I never found my self obliged, either by the Law of God, or Nature, to set a Centry at his Door for his Safety, but as he was always to take his Advantage, as it appeareth, so I of him, to take any Opportunity offered. Moreover, we being in no Terms of Capitulation; but on the contrair, by his Instigation being excluded from all Grace and Favour, thought it my Duty to pursue him at all occasions: Also My Lord, Sir William Sharp making his Apology, anent his unhandsome and cheating way taken, He took me, under pretence to have spoken with me about some other Matters. I not knowing him until five or six of his Brothers and his Servants were laying fast hold on me, they being armed of purpose, desired I would excuse him, seeing what he had done was upon his Brothers account, which excuse I easily admitted, seeing that he thought himself obliged to do

what he did to me, without Law or Order in behalf of his Brother, much more was I obliged to do what I did in behalf of many Brethren, whose Oppression was so great, and whose Blood he caused to be shed in such abundance. Moreover, he persisting in his Bloody Murthers, as witnesseth the wounding of *Mr. Bruce* at his taking, by his Emissaries some few days before that fell out concerning himself. Now if by any means in taking him away, I could have put a stop to the then currant Persecution. Thus far I have truly resumed what passed.

But this Answer to the second part of the Inditement may be thought by some to be a step out of my ordinary way; wherefore I shall offer to your Consideration that passage *Deut. 23.9.* wherein it is manifest, that the Seducer, or Inticer to worship a false God, is to be put to death, by the Hand of those whom he seeks to turn away from the Lord, especially by the Hand of the Witnesses, whereof I am one, as it appeareth *Deut. 13.* which Precept I humbly take to be Moral, and not merely Judicial, and that it is not at all Ceremonial, or Levitical; And as every moral Precept is universal, as to the extent of Place, so also as to the extent of Time, and Persons. Upon which Command, Sir, I think that *Phinehas* acted in taking away the *Midianitish* Whore, and killed him whom she had seduced, *Num. 25.8.* Also *Elijah* by virtue of that Precept gave Commandment to the People to destroy *Baals* Priests, contrary to the Command of the seducing Magistrate, who was not only remiss and negligent in executing Justice, but became a Protector and Defender of the Seducers. Then, and in that Case, I suppose it is the

Christians

Christians Duty not to be very dark. Moreover, we
 see that the People of *Israel* 2 Chron. 31. 1. destroyed
 Idolatry not only in *Judah*, wherein the King concurred,
 but in *Israel* and in *Manasseh*, where the King himself
 was an Idolater. And surely what all the People was
 bound to do by the Law of God, every one was bound
 to do it, to the uttermost of their power and capacity:
 And as it was in *Zach.* 13. 3. There the Seducer's Fa-
 ther and Mother shall put them to death: I take this to
 be meant of the Christian Magistrate; but when he is
 withdrawn by the Seducer from the Exercise of Office
 and Duty, and is become utterly remiss and negligent
 in putting the Seducer to death, according to God's ex-
 press Law, which is not to be expected of him, for then
 he should do Justice upon himself, but is become a
 Protector and Defender of the Idolater; then I doubt
 not, but that it doth become the Duty of every Chris-
 tian, to the uttermost of his power and capacity, to
 destroy and cut off both Idolatry and Idolaters. Yea,
 these presumptuously murthering Prelates ought to be
 called so by the Avenger of Blood, when he meeteth
 them, by the express Commandment of God, seeing
 the thing is manifestly true, and not to have liberty to
 flee to such Cities of Refuge, as the vain Pretext of Law-
 ful Authority: But they should be taken from the Horns
 of such Altars, and be put to death. Moreover, was it
 spoken concerning *Amalek*, upon the account he design-
 ed and resolved the Extirpation of the Lords People and
 Truth, which are his Throne, upon which he put forth
 his Hand, and because he took occasion against them;
 Exod. 17. 14. Num. 24. 20. he endeavoured God should
 not have a People to serve him according to his Reveal-
 ed Will upon Earth: And if he could have effectuate
 his

' his Design, there should none have lived, who would
 ' not have worshiped and served him, and his Idol-Gods:
 ' And for the better effectuating his Design, he took occa-
 ' sion against them, when they were wearied coming out
 ' of *Ægypt*, *Deut.* 25. 17, 18. and the Reason there an-
 ' nexed is, he feared not God. And because I know
 ' that the Bishops both will and do say, that what
 ' they did against the Lords People, whom they
 ' murthered, they did it by Law and Authority, but what
 ' I did was contrary to both. I answer, the King himself
 ' and all the Estates of the Land, and every individual
 ' person of the Land, both were, and are obliged by the
 ' Oath of God upon them, to have by Force of Arms
 ' extirpated the perjured Prelates and Prelacy, and in
 ' doing thereof to have defended their Lives and For-
 ' tunes, the Covenants being engaged to on these Terms,
 ' *viz.* after Supplications, Remonstrances, Protestations
 ' and all other Lawful Means have been used now for
 ' that Effect: As the last Remedy we took up Arms,
 ' upon which condition, our Nobility, and all the Re-
 ' presentatives of the Nation, according to the National
 ' Covenant, and Solemn League and Covenant, gave to
 ' the King both the Sword and the Scepter, and set the
 ' Crown upon his Head; and he accordingly received
 ' them, and promised and sware by the ever-living God,
 ' to use and approve them for the use aforesaid: And e-
 ' specially in order to the performing this Article, *viz.* the
 ' Extirpation and Overthrow of Prelates and Prelacy,
 ' and now they vaunt of Authority; of what Authority
 ' do they mean or speak of, truly I know not, except it
 ' be the Authority of their aggregated Gods, new Gods,
 ' Gods of whom they have their Gain, Life and Stand-
 ' ing, *Chemosh* or *Bacchus*, which drunken *Moab* delighted
 ' to

to dwell within dark Cells, *Ashlaroth*, or *Venus*, whom
 they worship of the female kind, because of their Ad-
 dulteries and Whoredoms, as also *Malcome*, or *Molock*,
 which signifies Tyrannical King, or a Devil, if they
 will have it so, in whose Arms and Power they put their
 poor Infants and Posterity to be burnt according to his
 lust and pleasure, *Amos 5. vers. 26. Psal. 106. 37.* and
 their Mammon, which they delight to worship daily, to-
 gether with their own Bellies, whose glory is their shame,
 who mind earthly things, whose end will be destruction,
 except they repent, which there is little probability of,
Ph. 3. vers. 19. to which we may add their abominable
 Pride, and blasphemous Perjuries, then their Gods will
 be equal in number to the Whore their Mothers Sacra-
 ments, from whom they have their Being, Strength
 and Standing, and from the Devil their Father, who
 was a Deceiver and Murtherer from the Beginning.
 And now seeing the Prelates possess whatever their
 God *Chemosh* giveth them to possess: Then should
 we not possess what the Lord our God giveth
 us to possess, viz. the eternal Truths manifested
 to us in his Revealed Will, and keep and defend
 the same from all Innovations and Traditions of
 his and our Adversaries, defend our Lives and Liber-
 ties out of the Hands of our usurping Enemies, *Judg.*
11. 29. for sure I am, that God once dispossessed the
 Prelates and Malignants of all these; and should they
 again possess them through our Defect? God forbid, but
 the like of this Work our murthering Prelates like not,
 who plead like the Whore their Mother for Passive Obe-
 dience, and that all the Lord's People, who may not
 comply with their Idolatries and Perfidies, should lay

down

' down their Bloody Axe, with whom too many of our
 ' hypocritical, time-serving and perfidious Professors
 ' do agree, who had rather abide with *Reuben* among the
 ' Sheepfolds, than jeopard Life or Fortune in the Help
 ' of the Lord against the Mighty ; do not consider the
 ' bitter Curse pronounced by the Angel of the Lord a-
 ' gainst *Meroz* ; to which immediately he subjoins a
 ' Blessing on *Jael* the Wife of *Heber* the Kenite. Others
 ' excuse themselves thus, Vengeance is mine, and I will
 ' repay it, but so the Throne of Judgment is the Lords,
 ' and by this they will take away the Use and Office of
 ' Magistracy, which erroneous Principles I detest : For
 ' God even in the working of Miracles in dividing the Red-
 ' Sea, *Exod. 14. 16.* commanded *Moses* to stretch forth
 ' his Rod : And Christ when he opened the Blind Man's
 ' Eyes, maketh use of Clay and Spittle, tho indeed I
 ' mean not of any who were willing to have helped, but
 ' wanted Opportunity, yet there are many peevish time
 ' serving Professors, who shall never suffer, so long as
 ' they have either Soul or Conscience to mortgage, pro-
 ' viding that they may keep them from suffering. And
 ' if it will not do their Business, it seemeth before they
 ' suffer, they resolve to sell all out at the Ground.

Now, Sir, I have neither misinterpret Scripture, nor
 misapplyed it, in regard of the persons here hinted at,
 nor been wrong in the end, which ought to be the
 Glory of God, the Good of his Church and People.
 Then I think that some persons ought to forbear to
 scourge me so sore with their Tongues, while I am not
 yet condemn'd by the common Enemy. And my hear-
 ing of some things reported by some behind my Back,
 hath occasioned my writing to you at this time. O, Sir,
 be

be intreated to pray to the Lord in my behalfe, that he
 would be pleased out of his Mercy and Goodness, to
 save me from sinning under Suffering in this Hour and
 Power of Darkness: For my Soul is prest within me
 in the Search betwixt Sin and Duty, *viz.* lest I should
 be niggard and too sparing of my life, when God calleth
 for it: And on the other hand, too prodigal and lavish
 of it, in not using all legal Defences in preserving of
 it, and in any of the like nature; I am in a strait, O
 Lord, undertake for me. *Sir*, I hope ye will excuse
 me in sending you these indistinct and irregular Lines,
 when you consider my present condition. *Sir*, believe
 me, I would many times, when I am before them,
 think a Scaffold a sweet Retirement, lest they should
 cheat and deceive me, in making me either to stain the
 declarative Glory of God, my own Conscience, or
 his People and Interests, and wronging of them, either
 by opening the Enemies Mouth against them, or letting
 loose their Hands upon them; henceforth let the Ad-
 versaries both say and do what they can, yet *the righ-
 teous shall hold on in his way, and he who hath clean
 hands will be stronger and stronger*, Job 7. v. 9. But he
 that saith unto the wicked, thou art righteous, him shall
 the people curse, Nations shall abhor him, Prov. 24. v. 24.
 Farewel in the Lord.

Sic subscrabitur

Mr. JAMES MITCHELL.

F I N I S.

N

માનુષનાની

ЛІНІОТИП ГАМБУЛІМ

•SIXTEEN

4

A Collection of TRACTS Relating to the late and present State of Scotland.

CONTAINING

A Memorial for his Highness the Prince of Orange, in relation to the Affairs of Scotland, &c.

An Account of the present Persecution of the Church in Scotland, in several Letters.

The Case of the present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland truly represented, &c.

An Historical Relation of the late General Assembly, held at Edinburgh, &c.

A Continuation of the Historical Relation of the late General Assembly in Scotland, &c.

A Vindication of the Government in Scotland, during the Reign of K. Charles II. against Mis-Representations made in several scandalous Pamphlets. To which is added, the Method of proceeding against Criminals, &c.

Presbyterian Inquisition, as it was lately practised against the Professors of the College of Edinburgh, Aug. and Sept. 1690. &c.

The History of Scotch Presbytery; being an Epitome of the Hind let loose, by Mr. Shields, &c.

The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, or, the Foolishness of their Teaching discovered from their Books, Sermons, and Prayers, and some Remarks on Mr. Rule's late Vindication of the Kirk.

A Letter to a Friend, giving an Account of all the Treatises that have been publish'd with Relation to the Present Persecution against the Church of Scotland.

An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland, in answer to a late Presbyterian Vindicator; together with a Postscript relating to a Scandalous Pamphlet, Intituled, an Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence.

An Account of the late Establishement of Presbyterian Government by the Parliament of Scotland, Anno 1690. Together with the Methods by which it was settled, and the Consequences of it, as also several Publick Acts, Speeches, Pleadings, and other Matters of Importance, relating to the Church in that Kingdom; to which is added the Summary of the Visitation of the Universities there, in a fifth Letter from a Gentleman in Edinburgh to his Friend at London.

The Spirit of Calumny and Slander, examin'd, chastis'd, and expos'd; in a Letter to a Malicious Libeller. More particularly address'd to Mr. George Ridpath, Newsmonger, near St. Martins in the Fields. Containing some Animadversions on his Scurrilous Pamphlets, published by him against the Kings, Parliaments, Laws, Nobility and Clergy of Scotland: Together with a short account of Presbyterian Principles, and Consequential Practices.

London:

Printed for Joseph Hindmarsh, at the Golden Ball over against the Royal Exchange in Cornhill. 1693.

Collaboration of TRACCS Results
to the first and largest survey of galaxies

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

17. *Georgiopolis* (Georgiopolis) is a town in the northern part of Cyprus. It is located in the Famagusta District, about 10 km (6 miles) west of the town of Famagusta. The town is situated on a hillside overlooking the sea, and is surrounded by vineyards and olive groves. It is a popular tourist destination, with many hotels and restaurants. The town is also known for its ancient ruins, including a Byzantine church and a Roman bathhouse.

وَلِلَّهِ الْحَمْدُ لِمَا يَعْلَمُ وَلِلَّهِ الْحَمْدُ لِمَا يَعْلَمُ وَلِلَّهِ الْحَمْدُ لِمَا يَعْلَمُ وَلِلَّهِ الْحَمْدُ لِمَا يَعْلَمُ

and would be a great help to the Government in their efforts to combat the disease and to help the people to live longer and more comfortably.

W. H. Brewster, who is expert in bird life, made the arrangements and provided the guides, and a number of his students and friends accompanied the party.